

378.05

A5

A86

cop. 2

VOLUME III

MAY, 1917

NUMBER 5

PART I

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements.....	3
National Conference Committee.....	3
Treasurer's Statement.....	7
Membership.....	8
Members Elected.....	8
Nominations.....	8
Report on College of Wooster.....	13

gift
Prof. E. C. Case
5-9-28

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

PLACE OF ANNUAL MEETING.—The informal ballot of the Council resulted in a considerable plurality of votes in favor of Chicago and the choice has since been ratified by a majority vote. The dates are likely to be December 28 and 29.

LOCAL BRANCHES.—Local branches have been recently organized at Colgate University, George R. Berry, Chairman, and at the University of Maine, A. P. Raggio, Chairman, George D. Chase, Secretary. At the University of Minnesota, George N. Bauer, and at Northwestern University, William A. Locy, have been elected chairmen for the current year.

Valuable expressions of opinion in regard to the interpretation of certain requirements for membership, and in regard to suggested amendments have been received from several local branches and transmitted to Chairman Woodward of Committee E. Others will be acceptable.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM REPORTS.—The Montana report issued herewith as Part Two completes the publication of the work of 1915. The delay has been due to exceptional conditions and to the wide separation of members of the Committee. This BULLETIN includes the second report of the present Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, dealing with a somewhat remarkable situation in the College of Wooster. The number of such cases brought to the attention of the officers of the Association is unfortunately too large for adequate treatment by our existing machinery, and the selection of cases which can be most advantageously investigated is a matter of no small difficulty.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The report of the tenth annual conference held at New York, March 24, deals with a number of interesting questions, and also summarizes the work of the previous decade.

The conference includes representatives of the National Association of State Universities, the College Entrance Examination Board, The New England College Entrance Certificate Board, the Carnegie Foundation, The U. S. Bureau of Education and the four college and preparatory school associations of New England, the

Middle States and Maryland, the Southern States and the North Central States.

Among matters dealt with in various years are: the establishment and conduct of certificate boards for college admission and the use of their lists; the transfer of college entrance examinations to the college board; migration of college students, honorable dismissal, etc.; participation of secondary schools in the framing of admission requirements. The present report deals in some detail with migration of college students and with college marking systems, of which a tabular list is given for sixty-four institutions. Reprints of this may be obtained on application to Prof. F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.

MIGRATION.—In regard to migration, the report reads in part as follows:

Candidates for transfer are of all sorts and descriptions, but omitting the cases when a transfer is desired because the family has moved to another part of the country, they fall into two very general types: those who are not doing well academically and who think they may improve their chances for a degree by a change; and those who are making good records but who feel that they can make a better investment of their time at some other institution. Speaking very generally, the first group includes the undesirables and the second group the desirables.

It would certainly be desirable if an impartial body, such as the Conference on Standards, could approve and recommend to the colleges some plan of procedure sufficiently elastic to safeguard the interests both of the good college and of the serious and capable student.

The Committee is not unanimous as to the definite policy to be recommended. The following three general plans have been proposed, subject in each case to satisfactory certificate of health, character, and conduct, after a college residence of at least a year, and the filing of an application with full details in sufficient time to enable the case to receive careful study before the opening of the term:

1. That a reasonably definite statement as to the minimum period of residence and the specific subjects, if any, which will be prescribed should be made in advance to candidates from approved institutions standing in the highest third of their classes, all other candidates to be admitted, if at all, as unclassified students, with the understanding that details as to candidacy for a degree can be determined only after the completion of an approved program. Or

2. That students may be admitted to candidacy on the basis of a satisfactory academic record, as evidenced by complete transcript from a standard college, final credit toward degree, however, to be contingent upon subsequent satisfactory record in college to which transfer is made. Or

3. That admission shall depend upon satisfactory record, but that no candidate shall be fully accepted as a candidate for a degree with terms of graduation exactly defined until after the work of one full college year, and that no student shall receive a degree except after two full years of residence and study.

The report was accepted and the Committee continued, and the members requested to obtain information from the colleges upon the approved list of the Association of American Universities as to the adoption of a general policy and its announcement in the catalogues of the institutions concerned.

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION PROPOSALS.—The Commission of eleven members, including two representatives of this Association, has completed its work and rendered a report on the Proposed Plan of Insurance and Annuities to the Carnegie Foundation. Essentially the recommendations contained in the report are understood to have been accepted by the Foundation. Copies of the Report have been sent to members of Committee P, but it is not yet available for publication.

COMMITTEE J. DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE SEVERAL HONORARY DEGREES AND THE BASIS FOR CONFERRING THEM

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES:

Since receipt of your replies to my last (second) circular letter, I have continued to investigate the whole subject of honorary degrees. Owing to the European war, I have been placed at certain disadvantages in obtaining material. Nevertheless, I judge that the facts and statistics now assembled are sufficient to admit of a tentative report. This I propose to outline in the near future. In these circumstances, I should be greatly obliged were all members of the committee to favor me with further suggestions, and this without delay. *R. M. WENLEY, Chairman, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.*

COMMITTEE O. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PH.D. DEGREE.—In view of the action of the Association at its last Annual Meeting, the members of Committee O on the Ph.D. Degree will be glad to receive information regarding institutions in which this degree is conferred under fraudulent conditions or as a result of gross irregularities in the requirements for the degree. Communications should be addressed to the *Chairman, James R. Angell, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.*

COMMITTEE S. SUMMER SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.—The chairman of the committee (*F. N. Scott, University of Michigan*) will be glad to receive communications bearing on the following questions from anyone who is interested:

1. Upon what principles—economic, psychological, physiological, or other—may be determined (a) the ideal length of a term, or

other period of continuous instruction, (b) the proportion of vacation to working-time?

2. In what institution of higher education was a summer school first organized as an integral part?

3. Was the quarter system in use anywhere prior to its establishment at the University of Chicago?

4. Has any institution ever divided the college year into three terms of four months each?

The chairman will also welcome reports of specific cases in which the summer school has operated adversely to the increase of salaries or the pursuit of research.

COMMITTEE T. THE PLACE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.—The committee has begun its work. The chairman has sent out to the members of the committee a list of topics to be considered. Among these are—methods of nomination and election of administrative officers and members of the instructional staff, methods of determining budgets, functions of the faculty in the determination of changes in educational policies, functions of the faculty in the control of student discipline and extra-curricular activities, the place of the faculty in judging the efficiency of its own members, procedure in cases of dismissal and demotion of members of the professorate, the delimitation of the respective provinces and powers of the Board of Trustees and the faculty. Local branches and individual members of the Association have been asked to consider these topics, with the local member of the committee. The chairman invites members of the Association at other points to communicate to him any views which they may hold strongly on the above topics. He will be glad to send, upon application, copies of the "Proposed Constitution for the Ohio State University," being the report of the local committee on university organization now in print, so long as the supply holds out. *J. A. Leighton (Philos.), Chairman, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.*

The Secretary is indebted to Professor Vaughan MacCaughey of the College of Hawaii for a type-written bibliography on "The College President," the references beginning with 1911.

CIRCULARS OF INFORMATION.—A considerable supply of the four-page circular is available for distribution to persons who may be interested to consider joining the Association.

TREASURER'S STATEMENT

Cash on hand December 27, 1916.....	\$109.97	
Contributions towards 1916 deficit.....	1,025.05	
1916 bills paid.....		\$1,035.99
Balance from 1916.....		99.03
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$1,135.02	\$1,135.02

SUMMARY OF 1916 DISBURSEMENTS

BULLETIN.....	\$1,293.72
Secretary's office.....	446.57
Secretary's expenses.....	94.46
Assistant secretary.....	479.11
Treasurer's office.....	65.25
President's office.....	191.90
Academic Freedom Reports of 1915.....	628.89
Com. A (Academic Freedom).....	306.72
Com. P (Pensions and Insurance).....	158.63
Other Committees.....	56.11
New York Annual Meeting.....	159.72
	<hr/>
	\$3,881.08

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS 1917

Balance from 1916.....	\$99.03	
Annual dues and sales of BULLETIN.....	3,423.90	
Interest.....	13.97	
BULLETIN (Jan., Feb., Mar., Apr.).....		\$875.33
Secretary's office.....		280.43
Assistant secretary.....		166.64
Treasurer's office.....		97.12
President's office.....		18.82
Com. A (Academic Freedom).....		26.63
Com. C (Methods of Recruiting).....		66.48
Com. M (Pan-American Recommendations).....		12.85
Cash on hand, May 23, 1917.....		1,992.60
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$3,536.90	\$3,536.90

DUES.—Attention is called to the fact that, as shown in the Treasurer's Statement, a considerable number of dues are still unpaid. Under a recent vote of the Council, members whose dues are unpaid after June 1 cease to receive the BULLETIN.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Association, including the names of those whose election is announced below is 2,023. The number of institutions represented is 100.

MEMBERS ELECTED

The following nominees whose names were published in the February or a previous BULLETIN have been elected to membership in the Association:

Dartmouth College

W. R. Gray
J. V. Hazen
C. A. Holden
W. H. Murray

Grinnell College

Paul F. Peck

University of Maine

C. W. Easley
J. B. Segall

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

R. P. Bigelow

Northwestern University

R. B. Dennis

Oberlin College

K. L. Cowdery
L. E. Lord
E. A. Miller
Mary E. Sinclair
R. H. Stetson
C. H. A. Wager

Ohio State University

Clyde Brooks

Tulane University

E. J. Northrup
J. C. Ransmeier

West Virginia University

A. M. Reese

Yale University

A. L. Bishop

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following eighty-one nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,* and will be considered by the Committee if received *before Sept. 1*.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of J. Q. Dealey (Brown), Chairman; Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Edward Capps (Princeton), J. V. Denney (Ohio State), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

*Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

The names of nominators follow the name of each nominee in parentheses. Nominators for whom no institution is specified are colleagues of the nominee.

- J. Q. Adams (English), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Riley)
- Alfred G. Arvold (Public Discussion), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, F. H. Koch and A. J. Becker, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- Charles H. Barnwell (English), Alabama,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, H. B. Almstedt, Missouri)
- Willis H. Bocock (Greek), Georgia,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, J. S. Ankeny, Missouri)
- Alexander L. Bondurant (Latin), Mississippi,
(G. Howe, J. G. DeR. Hamilton and A. S. Wheeler, North Carolina)
- Charlotte A. Bragg (Chemistry), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, K. L. Bates, M. S. Case)
- Ernest Calvin Bryant (Physics), Middlebury,
(W. E. McElfresh, Williams, C. R. Cross and H. W. Tyler, M. I. T.)
- C. K. Burdick (Law), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- W. B. Carver (Mathematics), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- G. R. Chamberlain (Freehand Drawing), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Charles H. Chase (Mechanical Engineering), Tufts,
(G. C. Anthony, A. C. Lane, H. V. Neal)
- Olynthus Burroughs Clark (History), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and B. F. Shambaugh, Iowa)
- Anna B. Comstock (Nature Study), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Martha Pike Conant (English Literature), Wellesley,
(K. L. Bates, M. W. Calkins, A. O. Norton)
- Edwin B. Davis (Romance Languages), Rutgers,
(Lane Cooper, J. E. Creighton and A. A. Young, Cornell)
- Charles Oscar Denny (Latin), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and F. C. Eastman, Iowa)
- R. C. Donoghue (Soils), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, H. E. Simpson and A. G. Leonard, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- M. Dresbach (Physiology), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- C. L. Durham (Latin), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Homer K. Elright (Classics), Baker,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- R. A. Emerson (Plant Breeding), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- J. Ewing (Pathology), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)

- P. A. Fish (Veterinary), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Elizabeth F. Fisher (Geology), Wellesley,
(C. B. Thompson, A. O. Norton, S. C. Hart)
- Caroline R. Fletcher (Latin), Wellesley,
(A. O. Norton, M. W. Calkins, M. S. Case)
- J. H. Frandsen (Dairy Husbandry), Nebraska,
(G. O. Virtue, J. E. Le Rossignol, H. W. Caldwell)
- James Geddes, Jr. (Romance Languages), Boston (University),
(L. C. Newell, E. F. Langley and R. P. Bigelow, Mass. Inst. of Tech.)
- George W. Hartwell (Mathematics), Hamline,
(G. D. Walcott, C. J. Keyser, Columbia, E. Kasner, Columbia)
- Harold Heath (Zoölogy), Leland Stanford Jr.,
(E. C. Franklin, L. R. Lenox, J. M. Stillman)
- Henry T. Hildreth, Roanoke,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- W. D. Hooper (Latin), Georgia,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, J. S. Ankeny, Missouri)
- Joseph W. Ince (Chemistry), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, G. E. Hult and A. J. Becker, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- O. A. Johannsen (Entomology), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- E. S. Keene (Engineering), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, E. F. Chandler and A. J. Becker, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- Elizabeth Kimball Kendall (History), Wellesley,
(M. S. Case, M. W. Calkins, S. C. Hart)
- John Samuel Kenyon (English), Hiram,
(O. F. Emerson, H. P. Cushing and W. H. Hulme, Western Reserve)
- Sherman Kirk (Greek), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and E. D. Starbuck, Iowa)
- H. B. Longden (Modern Languages), De Pauw,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, J. S. Ankeny, Missouri)
- H. H. Love (Plant Breeding), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Roy V. Magers (History), Park,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- O. G. Markham (Classics), Baker,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- Herbert Martin (Philosophy), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and E. Faris, Iowa)
- S. A. Martin (Philosophy), Lafayette,
(F. B. Peck, J. W. Tupper, C. McC. Gordon)
- J. C. Metcalf (English), Richmond,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- Daniel Webster Morehouse (Physics), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and L. P. Sieg, Iowa)
- Isaac Franklin Neff (Mathematics), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and L. P. Sieg, Iowa)

- Charles B. Newcomer (Latin), N. Mexico College of Agriculture,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, Herman Almstedt, Missouri)
- C. S. Northup (English), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Frank Owen Norton (Greek), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and E. Faris, Iowa)
- Charles F. Park (Mechanical Engineering), Mass. Inst. of Tech.
(H. G. Pearson, E. B. Wilson, H. W. Tyler)
- Charles E. Payne (History), Grinnell,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and B. F. Shambaugh, Iowa)
- Alfred John Pearson (German), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and F. B. Sturm, Iowa)
- Walter Peterson (Greek), Bethany,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- William L. Raub (Philosophy), Knox,
(S. G. Lowrie, G. A. Tawney and P. Ogden, Cincinnati)
- D. Reddick (Plant Pathology), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Roe E. Remington (Food Inspection), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, J. M. Gillette and G. E. Hult, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- F. K. Richtmeyer (Physics), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- H. Ries (Geology), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- James Theron Rood (Electrical Engineering), Lafayette,
(F. B. Peck, J. W. Tupper, C. McC. Gordon)
- Luther Sherman Ross (Zoölogy), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, H. G. Plum and B. Shimek, Iowa)
- John P. Ryan (Public Speaking), Grinnell,
(C. B. Wilson, C. F. Ansley and H. G. Plum, Iowa)
- J. H. Shepperd (Agriculture), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, E. F. Chandler and O. G. Libby, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- William E. Simonds (English), Knox,
(F. W. Chandler, Max Poll and S. G. Lowrie, Cincinnati)
- Lewis Worthington Smith (English), Drake,
(C. B. Wilson, C. F. Ansley and H. G. Plum, Iowa)
- Lillian Smith (Latin), Agnes Scott,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, J. S. Ankeny, Missouri)
- William Mackay Smith (Mathematics), Lafayette,
(F. B. Peck, J. W. Tupper, C. McC. Gordon)
- Wallace N. Stearns (History), North Dakota,
(James E. Boyle, N. Dakota Agric., E. F. Chandler, J. Kennedy)
- Glanville Terrell (Classics), Kentucky,
(Walter Miller, H. Almstedt and A. H. R. Fairchild, Missouri)
- G. F. Warren (Farm Management), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- Frank Casper Wagner (Electrical Engineering), Rose Polytechnic,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)

- Frank Dekker Watson (Social Work), Haverford,
(D. C. Barrett, L. W. Reid, W. W. Baker)
- Arland D. Weeks (Education), N. Dakota Agricultural,
(James E. Boyle, J. Kennedy and A. J. Ladd, Univ. of N. Dakota)
- Edward M. Weyer (Philosophy), Washington and Jefferson,
(Allen Johnson, Yale, H. C. Warren and E. G. Spaulding, Princeton)
- E. A. White (Floriculture), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- K. M. Wiegand (Botany), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- J. A. Winans (Public Speaking), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- H. H. Wing (Animal Husbandry), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- A. L. Wolfe (Latin), Park College,
(Walter Miller, Missouri, R. J. Bonner, Chicago, D. M. Robinson, Hopkins)
- Howard Spencer Woodward (English), Western Reserve,
(O. F. Emerson, W. H. Hulme, H. P. Cushing)
- A. H. Wright (Zoölogy), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)
- C. V. P. Young (Physical Education), Cornell,
(E. Merritt, W. F. Willcox, W. A. Ripley)

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

REPORT ON CONDITIONS AT THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER AND THE DISMISSAL OF THE DEAN OF WOMEN

INTRODUCTION

In February, 1916, the officers of the American Association of University Professors received a communication signed by a number of members of the faculty of the College of Wooster, asking for an investigation of the circumstances attending the dismissal of Miss Winona A. Hughes, Dean of Women. Upon the recommendation of this committee, an investigation was ordered. A special sub-committee, consisting of Professor H. A. Aikins, of Western Reserve University, Professor W. H. Hobbs of the University of Michigan, and Professor J. E. Hagerty of Ohio State University was appointed to conduct the inquiry. Later, as the importance of the case became clear, the sub-committee was enlarged by the addition of Professor A. S. Hershey of the University of Indiana and Professor A. W. Moore of the University of Chicago.

The inquiries of the sub-committee have been thorough-going and painstaking. It finds that not only was the dismissal of Miss Hughes accomplished in an improper manner, but that the general situation at Wooster is "serious in the extreme, involving not only questions of academic freedom, but a much more serious question of general academic ideals." In endeavoring to convey an accurate impression of these conditions the sub-committee has carefully avoided, so far as possible, the use of general description or characterization, but has let the documents and the other recorded facts in the case tell their own story. "But it is obvious," the sub-committee concludes, "that the methods of the present administration have not been such as to appeal to the loyalty of a

conscientious and self-respecting faculty, and it is equally obvious that they are not the methods which gain for a college the confidence and respect of the academic world."

We commend the methods used by the sub-committee in its inquiries, and approve the publication of its report.

C. E. BENNETT (Cornell University),
 W. B. CANNON (Harvard University),
 R. T. ELY (University of Wisconsin),
 F. A. FETTER (Princeton University),
 F. H. HODDER (University of Kansas),
 GEORGE LEFEVRE (University of Missouri),
 J. P. LICHTENBERGER (University of Pennsylvania),
 F. R. LILLIE (University of Chicago),
 A. O. LOVEJOY (Johns Hopkins University),
 D. O. MCGOVNEY (University of Iowa),
 F. M. PADELFORD (University of Washington),
 G. M. STRATTON (University of California),
 U. G. WEATHERLY (University of Indiana),
 ALLYN A. YOUNG (Cornell University), *Chairman.*

*Committee on Academic Freedom
 and Academic Tenure.*

CONTENTS

Causes of the Investigation	15
Part I.—The General Situation	17
Part II.—The Dismissal of Dean Hughes	28
Part III.—The Summer School, the Administration and the Faculty Majority	83
Concluding Remarks	128
Appendix	129

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

CAUSES OF THE INVESTIGATION

Towards the end of April, 1916, the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors appointed a subcommittee of three, afterwards enlarged to five, to investigate the dismissal or enforced resignation of Miss Winona A. Hughes, Dean of Women at the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, and other conditions at that institution.

The immediate cause of the investigation was the dismissal of Dean Hughes and the prevailing fear that others also were about to be dismissed. But it was soon found that the situation at Wooster is serious in the extreme, involving not only questions of academic tenure and academic freedom, but a much more serious general question of academic ideals. The majority of the faculty, backed by a minority of the Board of Trustees is engaged in a serious conflict with the "Administration": it believes that it is fighting to perpetuate decent academic ideals and a good academic tradition in the face of local and personal interests, and to save a valuable educational establishment from ruin at the hands of local trustees, a new president, the principal of the preparatory department of the College, and a few other members of the faculty, who wish, as the majority believe, to turn it to uses for which it could never have been intended. So intense is the struggle that one trustee did not hesitate to make a public attack upon the Administration, while another gave evidence against the College when it attempted (unsuccessfully) to obtain a Phi Beta Kappa charter.

It is charged that in their efforts to conciliate local interests and perpetuate a large summer school of distinctly low grade, the local trustees forced measures that led to the resignation of President Holden, infringed the legal rights of the faculty, and secured the election of a new President with little academic experience and no genuine scholarly interests, who was committed to their policies. And it is charged that this new President broke his pledges, sub-

jected members of the faculty majority and the faculty as a whole to repeated indignities, attempted to nullify action favorable to the faculty which had been taken by the full Board of Trustees, misrepresented the Board to the faculty, misrepresented members of the faculty to the Board, misrepresented to the Board essential facts of vital interest to the faculty as well as to the College, packed faculty committees in the interest of its minority, and in the faculty itself had persons of high academic standing deprived of their votes and others of low academic standing promoted for the sake of giving them votes, and tried to terrorize the majority into the surrender of its rights. It is also charged that the new President and the local trustees compassed the dismissal of Dean Hughes without just cause and in a manner wholly at variance with right standards.

Such are the principal charges which were involved in a rather tangled tale. It seemed best, however, not to deal so much with individual charges as to gain something like an historical account of the whole situation. The events investigated in detail cover a period of time stretching from the early winter of 1914-15 to the middle of June, 1916, though the story is brought down to the end of the year 1916.

Because there is no unanimity in either faculty or Board of Trustees, it has been necessary for the committee of inquiry to go behind the formal actions of both bodies as recorded in their official minutes and inquire into the attitudes of groups and individuals; and because of the vital issues at stake trustees and faculty members have been willing to testify upon these matters. Testimony on both sides has been very freely given, and the chairman of the committee of inquiry wishes to bear witness to the courtesy shown him by President White and others under trying circumstances.

The amount of evidence in possession of the committee of inquiry is large, including printed and written documents of various sorts, direct correspondence, and personal interviews. As to the interviews it may be stated that the chairman of the committee spent some eight days altogether in Wooster and interviewed a large number of persons, including the President (three times) and five other members of the local executive committee of the Board of Trustees. In all these cases notes of the interview were taken at the time and afterwards written up and submitted to the person interviewed for verification, correction and possible additional comment. None of this evidence was submitted to the committee until it had

been verified by the witness himself. The same method was pursued in the case of other important witnesses when there seemed to be any possibility of misunderstanding.

The report is divided into three sections. The first deals with the general situation and the general history of events up to the time of the dismissal of Dean Hughes by the executive committee of the Board on January 1, 1916. The second part deals with the case of Dean Hughes. The third part gives an account of the long fight between the faculty majority on the one side and the local trustees and the new President on the other. Those who do not care to read the whole report will find a summary of the Hughes case at the end of Part II and a summary of the last section of the report at the beginning of Part III.

PART I.—THE GENERAL SITUATION

THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

The College of Wooster, at Wooster, Ohio, advertises itself as follows: "The Leading College of America under Presbyterian Control—Assets, \$2,600,000—Twelve Modern Buildings Fully Equipped—One Hundred Acre Campus—Best Athletic Facilities in Ohio—Strongest Biblical Department among American Colleges—Frankly and Positively Christian—A National Institution and a World Force.—J. CAMPBELL WHITE, *President*."

The institution is known amongst Ohio Presbyterians as the Synodical College, and it receives contributions from Presbyterian churches throughout the whole state of Ohio. It is governed by a Board of Trustees with thirty members, appointed by the Synod of Ohio on the basis of nominations made by the Board itself, or, in the case of six of the thirty, by the alumni. Three-fourths of the whole Board must be communicant members of the Presbyterian Church. At least seven trustees must be resident freeholders of Wayne County, Ohio, and not more than five may be nonresidents of Ohio.

According to the charter and by-laws of the Board, its executive committee consists of those members of the Board who are resident in Wayne County, and this committee has preliminary jurisdiction over all College matters between meetings of the Board, though its acts are subject to review by the Board and it is supposed to send

a minute of its transactions to all members of the Board who are not also members of the committee.

In 1915-16 the active membership of the Board was twenty-seven or twenty-eight, and, as it happens, ten of these reside in the little city of Wooster, a pleasant rural center and college town of some 7,000 inhabitants. These ten Wooster citizens therefore constitute the executive committee, and inasmuch as they also constitute a third of the Board and can easily be present in full force at its meetings they exercise a commanding influence. Reversal of the committee's acts by the Board is exceedingly rare.

Thus the practical control of the institution lies in the hands of a group of men selected on the basis of a narrow geographical limitation, who all happen to live in the same small city, and who are naturally supposed to be subject to local influences.

It may be added that the president of the Board is not the president of the College, but, at present (January, 1917), one of the local trustees. It is claimed by many friends of the College that this local control is a principal source of its troubles, and the executive committee itself has promised to reduce the number of local trustees.* But under the charter seven seems to be the legal minimum.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL

J. H. Dickason (A.B., Wooster, '95, A.M., '98) is principal of the Wooster preparatory school (known as the Academy) and, though he does no college teaching, he holds a titular adjunct-professorship in the College. He has long been head of a summer school which was started in 1895 (before Dr. Holden's accession to the presidency). This Summer School, which was intended mainly for teachers, grew steadily until in 1915 it had an attendance of 1,551, which happens to be exactly three times the total enrollment in the College proper for 1915-16.

The Summer School was advertised as "affiliated with the University of Wooster." The trustees of the University (now the College) granted Professor Dickason the free use of the College buildings, including laboratories, which had to be vacated for his Summer School pupils and teachers, and in the autumn of 1914 the Trustees appear to have given a formal approval to his list of teach-

* *Report to Synod.* Other Ohio colleges, Oberlin for example, have no such local over-representation.

ers for the following summer. But to all intents and purposes the Summer School was a purely private enterprise and made no financial, educational, or administrative accounting to the College, except in so far as President Holden got payment from Professor Dickason for damages done to plant and apparatus.

In connection with the Summer School, Professor Dickason maintained and freely advertised a gratuitous teachers' agency, and the Summer School is said to have become a great meeting place for teachers and school superintendents; at all events Professor Dickason showed great skill and enterprise in finding positions for its patrons.

There were many things about the Summer School that the College faculty (or a majority of it) did not like. It was threatening to overshadow the College; students and teachers of very meagre academic attainments would spend a summer there and go away saying that they had studied or taught, as the case might be, "at Wooster"; only about ten per cent of those in attendance were doing work of college grade, the rest were doing high-school work or preparing themselves for positions in rural or elementary schools; rules of discipline prevailing during the year were swept away; Summer School teachers often covered their ground very rapidly, and members of the College faculty were often asked and perhaps urged to give credit for work that had not been done to their satisfaction.* The advertising matter of the Summer School was undignified, often inaccurate and sometimes misleading. There is no doubt that the majority of Professor Dickason's colleagues regarded and still regard the Summer School as an unworthy and undignified appendage to the College, threatening in more ways than one to do serious damage to the College itself.

The committee of inquiry cannot attempt to evaluate the teaching in the Summer School. It can state certain verifiable facts that throw light upon the character of the school.

Out of 74 persons advertised as teaching in the Summer School of 1912 (a year chosen at random) 8 appear as college professors or instructors, 5 of the 8 in Wooster; 22 are school superintendents at such places as Cardington, Bucyrus, Fredericktown, South Norwalk (Conn.), Millersburg, Wooster, New Bremen, (to take the

* Indeed it is stated in the *Summer School Handbook for 1914* (dated December, 1913) that all the work done in the Summer School is accepted by the University of Wooster (p. 5).

first seven in the list); 9 are supervisors; 9 are principals of ward or high schools (including Wooster Academy and its commercial department); some are high school teachers; some are merely listed as teachers; 3 or 4 are primary teachers; 2 are authors and lecturers; 1 is a photographer.

It is stated in the *Summer School Handbook* of December, 1913, that the Summer School "has not sought numbers," and the statement is repeated in the book for 1916; and yet every copy of the *Handbook* which we have seen contains a record of attendance for each year since the beginning of the school, and a cumulative statement, in terms of dollars and cents, of the amount of business done by the gratuitous Summer School teachers' agency. Half a page of the *Handbook* for 1912 is devoted to an account of two gold watches given to the man and woman who bring the largest delegations of new students to the school, the conditions of the contest, and the prize-winners of the year before, one of whom "had ten students to her credit," and the other sixteen to his. The *Handbooks* contain a considerable amount of other material of a distinctly unacademic character, and in the *Handbook for 1916*, issued after the Summer School had been taken over by the College, there is not only bad grammar, bad rhetoric, and bad taste, but an amazing number of inaccuracies, to say nothing of false or misleading statements. A College committee had been appointed by President White in October, 1915, with the verbal and written statement that it was "to be a general committee to get out the catalogue and approve all bulletins"; but this *Summer School Handbook* or bulletin had been published under another committee appointed by a body known as the Summer School Senate; and on May 5, 1916, the College committee had its protest against the undignified publication spread upon the minutes of the faculty.

In country newspapers the Summer School had been advertised as a "School of Inspiration, Preparation and Perspiration," and in the summer of 1916 the following paragraph was to be found in its printed advertisements of the lecture course:

Never in the history of the Summer School Course has so much that is good been offered for so little. Beef is going up. Brains and inspiration growing less. It costs more to fill the stomach, less to fill the soul. Low living going up, high living coming down. Outside finish dearer, inside furnishings less. Bard and sage and reader and artist and singer and poet and priest knock at your door. Open and let them in.

Professor Dickason and his school seem to have been a source of constant embarrassment to the faculty and President of the College. One witness speaks of being turned out of his laboratory for a Summer School teacher who destroyed precious specimens and left everything in confusion. Another witness says: "At one time Dr. Holden appointed a joint committee of faculty and trustees to confer with him, and bring his work into harmony with the other work of the College, and it all ended in Dickason's saying he could not work with anybody else. He has consistently refused to work with anybody else." In the same strain, a member of the faculty minority says that Professor Dickason was unwilling that President Holden should have much to do with the Summer School or the appointments in it. And Professor Dickason himself says that some years ago there was a question of his going elsewhere, and the Trustees sent to see what would keep him. One of his conditions was absolute control of the Summer School, and the conditions were accepted.

A few years ago the State of Ohio established four free, well-equipped, state normal schools and in 1914 it passed a law concerning the certification of teachers which demanded a certain amount of professional preparation (including practice teaching) carried on in approved institutions. The State Superintendent refused to recognize the Wooster Summer School as an approved institution, but intimated that work done in it by candidates for certificates for rural and elementary school positions would be recognized if the College of Wooster would not only be responsible for the Summer School but also give a regular two year normal school course, of which the Summer School could be regarded as a summer session. Professor Dickason suggested the establishment at Wooster of such a normal course.

The state law demands a certain preparation for high school teachers as well as for teachers in the grades; but this high school requirement has been met by the College of Wooster as it has been met more or less successfully by every other college in Ohio, and the question really at issue had to do with the granting of *credit for elementary and rural teachers* on the strength of work done at the Wooster Summer School.

The matter was taken up by the executive committee of the Board of Trustees, who requested the College faculty to prepare a statement upon it. The curriculum committee of the College

faculty, to which the question was referred, opposed the scheme on the ground that it was out of harmony with the purpose of Wooster as a college of liberal arts, and impracticable under Wooster's circumstances; and their report was adopted in the faculty by a vote of eighteen to five.

Professor Dickason had already made contracts with teachers for the next summer and feared a financial loss if the new arrangement could not be made. Moreover, the citizens of Wooster did not regard with indifference the loss of fifteen hundred persons every summer who were described in the local papers as "free with their expense accounts." The local papers were full of the subject, a petition to the Board was signed by 400 local business men, pressure was exerted in one way and another upon local trustees (who, as we have seen, constitute about a third of the Board), and on February 1, 1915, by a vote of 12 to 7 (a number of influential out-of-town members being absent) the full Board voted to inaugurate the two-year normal course. President Holden thereupon resigned, the resignation to take effect at the end of the college year. Of the nine local trustees who were present all but President Holden and Mr. McClellan (the College treasurer) voted for the normal school resolution.

It should be added that this normal school vote was not passed altogether on its merits, even as a means of saving the Summer School. The personal influence of Professor Dickason was strong, various members of the executive committee had come to resent President Holden's "domination," and the Board's abolition of fraternities and sororities in 1913 had left much feeling against him, even in the Board itself. Thus the fight was partly a personal matter.*

*The reasons given in defense of the normal school policy seem to have been (1) that the Summer School should be supported as an important feeder to the College (Dr. White says its students "make good boosters") and (2) that Wooster is an important missionary center and ought to make its religious influence felt through teachers sent into otherwise neglected rural communities. The faculty majority, who opposed the policy, say that only about one-tenth of the Summer School work is college work; that the Summer School teachers are recruited from all over the state and cannot transmit any influence peculiar to Wooster; that the College was neither founded nor endowed for normal school purposes; that "we cannot do normal school work except in an inferior manner, and there is no use in claiming that we can," that they wish to "do straight college work" and "keep true to type," to "keep up high college standards," "to be known as a college and not as a normal school" and "not be anxious for numbers." Professor

Dr. Holden had been president of Wooster for sixteen years. He left behind him a reputation for honesty and straightforwardness and seems to have had the respect, support, and affection of most of the faculty. When he assumed office, in 1899, the College had a campus of twenty acres and assets of \$350,000. Shortly afterwards there was a disastrous fire. Everybody agrees that to Dr. Holden's courage and energy and the confidence which he inspired, the College owes nearly all of its attractive buildings and much of its present endowment. During his administration the faculty grew rapidly and the new members whom he appointed to it soon came to assume the leadership in College matters, and introduced various changes. Unfortunately, however, he did not succeed in winning and retaining the entire sympathy of all those who were on the faculty at the time of his own appointment. Three of these older men, who are now amongst the oldest on the faculty, opposed President Holden on the normal school issue and are now supporting the new President and Professor Dickason.

These three older men, with Professor Dickason, are the leaders of the faculty "minority," the rest of which is made up almost altogether, if not entirely, of teachers from the Academy and the Con-

Dickason says: "A good deal of the trouble has come from those who have not had enough sympathy with the religious idea and have overvalued the intellectual side." The two-year normal course "is dead and rotted," yet something for the rural teachers "is the need." "I believe God has called me to this work." "A compromise is absolutely impossible. Either three or four [of his opponents] must go or the strife go on." "They laughed me to scorn when I suggested allowing stenography for college credit." "How can we get together when it is a matter of principle? I believe that the Synod of Ohio wants the things we are trying to do."

The University (now the College) of Wooster was projected by persons connected with the Presbyterian Synod of Ohio who desired with the direction and blessing of God, and for his glory, "to found an institution which for literary character shall be inferior to none in the West, and in which we can make the religious element all that may be desired." In their application for incorporation these persons stated that "the object of said corporation shall be the promotion of sound learning and education under religious influences such as is usually contemplated in colleges and universities" (*West's Brief, Wooster Quarterly*). Most of the endowment of this institution was given during the presidency of Dr. Holden, and there can be no doubt that Mr. Severance, the largest of the institution's donors, wished a high grade college under religious influences. The evidence of Mr. Severance's friends on this point is very positive, and after the normal school policy was adopted his son resigned or refused to accept a position on the Board.

servatory of Music, and of College subordinates, together with two men in psychology and education who were appointed in 1915, after the normal school was projected.

The minority leaders attribute the continued trouble in the faculty to the chagrin of the majority at Dr. Holden's defeat in his contest with Professor Dickason. The majority men believe that they are fighting for decent academic ideals; and there can be no doubt that men of scholarly attainments find it galling to have the policies of the College directed (largely for summer school purposes) by the principal of the preparatory school, a man who has had no college or university training outside of Wooster itself and who makes no claim to scholarship. One of the majority documents contains a page entitled "The Line-Up," in which the names and academic biographies of the majority and the minority are put in parallel columns to show (as it does) that almost all of the university training is on the side of the majority.

An interesting phase of the whole situation has to do with "loyalty to the Administration." In his *Wooster Quarterly* for April, 1915, Professor Notestein * says, "An unfortunate personal animus was injected into the discussion, very early, by insistence, with more zeal than wisdom, that this was largely a question of loyalty to the President [Holden]." In June, 1916, Professor Dickason told Mr. Aikins that several of his majority colleagues should be turned out "for disloyalty to the Administration, and they are just as certain that I ought to go. . . . The President has the responsibility, and therefore ought to have the controlling voice, in controlling the policy of the institution."

The normal school motion was made by Dr. J. Campbell White (now president of the College) whose testimony on the point (June 1, 1916) is as follows:

I don't know that I made the motion on which Dr. Holden resigned. I really can't say. It may be true. I think it is probably true that after we seemed to be deadlocked I presented a motion that looked like a compromise and something we could get together on, but I certainly was not in any sense the leader of any opposition to Dr. Holden.

In the *Wooster Quarterly* for April, 1915, Professor Notestein gives an account of the proceedings at that time which is not at all suggestive of compromise. He says: "President Holden went into

* Professor Notestein was a strong supporter of the normal school policy and is a recognized minority leader.

this controversy with all his energy, staking everything at last on carrying his point. In this way he made the situation one where he could scarcely avoid the conclusion that an adverse vote in the Board was what the English government interprets as a vote of 'want of confidence.' He so took the vote of 14 to 7 [it was really 12 to 7] against him and immediately resigned." (p. 80.) Other contemporary documents and a statement made by Dr. White himself in another connection leave no doubt that Professor Notestein's account of the situation is correct. It may be added that within less than one week after Dr. Holden resigned a strong advocate of the normal school policy (who, however, was not a resident of Wooster) wrote to at least three different members of the Board, including its president, Dr. Hills, advocating the election of Dr. White to the then vacant presidency of the College.

On March 29, six trustees, including Dr. White,* signed a call for a special meeting of the Board on May 18, "to consider the whole interests of Wooster at this time, and especially the normal school project and the securing of a president." At the meeting so called, the normal school legislation was judged to have been contrary to the charter and therefore illegal, because it had less than a two-thirds majority and because it provided for the management of the normal school and the Summer School in another way than through the faculty. The legislation was, therefore, unanimously repealed, though the policy was not repudiated.

At the same meeting Dr. Hills, the president of the Board, appointed a committee of five trustees to nominate a new president for the College. One of these five was Dr. White, another was the trustee who had written to Dr. Hills and others advocating the election of Dr. White, and a third was one of the two other men to whom he is known to have written. This committee invited certain representative members of the faculty to confer with it (Dean Compton, Professors Notestein and Kelso) and at the regular June meeting of the Board (a month after the committee was appointed) it nominated Dr. White for the presidency. In making the nomination, Dr. Weir, the chairman of the committee, said that this nomination was made "after consulting a committee of the faculty about the type of man that ought to be secured." This version of Dr. Weir's statement is the one given by Dr. White, who says he heard him make it. Dr. Weir and his colleagues on the

*The six were Messrs. Watson, Henderson, Hudnut, Wick, White, and West.

committee of the Board failed to say that Dr. White's name had never been mentioned to the faculty conferees, though others had been, and that the committee and the faculty conferees had agreed that the new president should have certain qualifications which Dr. White very obviously did not possess. The statement which Dr. Weir really made left the impression that the faculty approved of Dr. White's appointment, and one member of the Board, Professor Henderson, says he was astounded. But he believed the story as he understood it and voted for Dr. White, who, being still present, was elected.*

Dr. White was a Wooster graduate of the class of 1890; A.M., 1893. In college he was a prize orator. He attended the United Presbyterian Seminary, 1892-93; was College Secretary of the Inter-

* In fairness to Dr. Weir, the essential points in his testimony are given: "I was appointed as the local member (of the nominating committee) and because of my relation to the faculty I took pains to interview a number of members of the faculty as to the type of man they wanted and to see whether they cared to name anyone. I was in accord with the faculty and finally suggested that three members of the faculty confer with our nominating committee. Compton, Kelso, Notestein were the faculty members. I was careful that two should represent the majority. They were given full opportunity to say all they wished about the type of man and to nominate anyone. Up to that point Dr. White's name had not been suggested in any way by the committee. At an earlier time there was a good deal of thought that he would be called, but at that time I did not anticipate that his name would be presented. Then after a session of three or four hours White's name was suggested by one man and heartily seconded by another in the committee. . . . When White's name was suggested I still continued to urge the faculty view as to the type of man desirable, though I did not say directly they would not want White. When I saw it was hopeless to oppose action any longer I submitted to the majority. When we reported to the Board I was anxious to show that though we had reported very soon we had not been idle, so I outlined all that we had done, including the conference with the faculty. I did not mean to imply that the faculty had approved of White. I was concerned with another side of the case, namely, our care and industry. And I wanted the Board to know that the faculty had a full hearing, and it never occurred to me that it would be thought that we meant to say the faculty approved. As a matter of fact, we did consider the faculty standpoint; but the majority of the committee thought the responsibility rested on them, not on the faculty, and they acted in spite of the faculty. Both the committee and the Board were strong for White and nothing could have prevented his election. I myself had nominated another man, and he probably would have been elected if it had not been for the movement in favor of White. I actually presented a number of names, as I had most of the correspondence in my hands. It had not occurred to me even till now that any member of the Board would think that I had represented that the faculty had either approved or disapproved of White."

national Committee of the Y. M. C. A., 1890-91; Traveling Secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement, 1891-92; General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A., Calcutta, India, 1893-1902; Secretary of the Ways and Means Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, 1903-06; General Secretary, Laymen's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1906-15. He has published a tract entitled "What I believe and Why," and a volume of lectures on "Missions and Leadership."

A few days after his election, Dr. White had the faculty called together and asked their advice about accepting. The situation was awkward until one of the faculty suggested that the meeting break up into small groups and that Dr. White confer with each group privately. This was done, and he was told by one group after another that he was not qualified for the position. At his own request Dean Compton wrote to him afterwards,—to the same effect; and one or two others also wrote. One member of the faculty testifies that 22 out of 29 members of the faculty were opposed to his accepting.

Dr. White waited a month and then accepted the presidency, for reasons which he published at the time in the *Wooster Republican*. These reasons all centered about what he called his central missionary purpose. One of them we quote *in extenso*:

For twenty-five years I have been engaged in touching large numbers of the people. And it is a privilege in which anyone may properly rejoice. And I am not giving up expectation of still reaching larger numbers as a part of my work. But I am glad now to have the opportunity of a much longer and deeper influence on the lives of a limited number of leaders who in turn are to have vast opportunity in the world. Christ spent much of his time with a few men who were to catch his spirit and reproduce his life. "Character is caught, not taught," and it is communicated by contact.

The rescinding of the vote which had precipitated President Holden's resignation, without any avowed reversal of policy, left an open question of great moment to divide the new President and the local trustees on the one hand, and the faculty majority on the other, and there was conflict from the very opening of the session over everything that might affect Summer School policies. A letter written in December shows that members of the faculty had become convinced that the President would try to carry through his policies by forcing a majority. On January 1, 1916, came the letter dismissing Dean Hughes.

PART II.—THE DISMISSAL OF DEAN HUGHES

Miss Winona A. Hughes is a graduate of the College of Wooster of the Class of 1891. After graduation she devoted several years to secondary school teaching and then spent two years in the graduate department of the University of Chicago and one year as graduate fellow at Bryn Mawr. From there she was called to an instructorship in Chemistry at Mount Holyoke College, where she made an enviable record as a teacher and head of one of the principal halls of residence,* and apparently had every reason to expect a permanent position and a Carnegie pension. In 1910-11 Dr. L. E. Holden, then president of the College of Wooster, and the late L. H. Severance, then president of the Board of Trustees, were looking for a Dean of Women, and on their recommendation the Board invited her back to her alma mater, where she went in March, 1911, ostensibly as Field Secretary but really to test her for the position of Dean of Women, which was offered to her in April, 1912, a year later, and which she assumed the next autumn and filled in a way absolutely satisfactory to President Holden as long as he remained in office—a period of three years. Some time after Dean Hughes' appointment Mr. Severance died, and, as we have seen, President Holden resigned in February, 1915. His resignation took effect in the following June, and Dr. White accepted the presidency in July. On January 1, 1916, President White and the executive committee wrote Miss Hughes a letter which was afterwards interpreted to be a dismissal.

APPOINTMENT. DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED

In a letter addressed to whom it may concern ex-President Holden states that after the need for the appointment of a Dean of Women had become apparent he and Mr. Severance, then president of the Board, had met Miss Hughes at Mount Holyoke College, where they had gone to inspect a dormitory, and that after suggesting her for the deanship Mr. Severance had requested him to open correspondence with Miss Hughes in regard to the then vacant position of Field Secretary, stating that this "would give me the opportunity to study her gifts for the Deanship of Women."

*See Appendix. Letters from President Woolley, Dean Purington, President Small. The committee of inquiry has other letters from officers of Mount Holyoke College, all of similar purport.

Dr. Holden continues as follows:

At his request, I laid the matter before the Trustees, and the Trustees gave me the authority to go ahead, with the understanding that Miss Hughes should be in line for consideration for the Dean of Women's place when such appointment was to be made. It was thought not advisable to speak to her of this position, until we had tested her out in Mrs. Stuckenberg's work.

My correspondence led to Miss Hughes' coming to Wooster in the capacity of Field Secretary of the College among the Christian women of Ohio. Miss Hughes frankly stated "I have no experience in this field of labor and I must trust to your judgment as to my success." I am glad to say that Miss Hughes began at once to prove that our selection had been a wise one. She proved herself able to meet perfect strangers in a most satisfactory manner and to leave them as her personal friends.

Very frequently, I turned to her to assist me in getting individuals interested in certain worthy but poor students whose education depended upon outside help. Never did she fail me in securing that aid before the student was obliged to discontinue. I recall, among many incidents, two scholarships that were greatly needed, and when the facts became known to Miss Hughes she left for Pittsburgh on her own initiative and returned with the pledge of one from Mrs. ———. Again, she presented the other case to Mrs. ——— of Philadelphia, a woman of whom I had never so much as heard and she secured the cash in this case also, each scholarship endowed with \$1,000. Wherever she went she made friends for Wooster and secured in cash such help as was needed to keep several poor but worthy students in college. I never received from the field a single adverse criticism of Miss Hughes in any way, shape, nor manner. I know that the results of her work were, up to the time she was appointed Dean, considered most satisfactory by all concerned.

I was ordered by the Board of Trustees to present to her the work of Dean of Women and did so. We were all acquainted with her scholastic record. . . . We had tested her for six months* in field work for the College, and carefully observed the results. We had knowledge of her Christian character and influence and we were all given an opportunity to express our judgment at the election of Miss Hughes as Dean of Women, and without a dissent on the part of any trustee, she was unanimously chosen Dean of Women.

It was a most difficult position for any woman to assume. In the first place two matrons were in charge of their respective cottages or halls. Those ladies could not be expected to welcome supervision and the students much preferred to be without it. In the second place, the young men did not care to have a Dean of Women and they could do many things to make it uncomfortable for any such person. One of the matrons knew she could not endure a Dean over her, and so stated and sent in her resignation at once without ever trying the experiment. I expected more or less opposition to this new administrative office, and was not disappointed. However, I was agreeably surprised that it could be handled with such grace and wisdom as was displayed by Miss Hughes. She had no sooner proved herself capable and satisfactory than the expulsion of the fraternity system from the College, by the Board of Trustees, was launched.

*It was more nearly twelve months.

While Miss Hughes was a member of one of the sororities in College, she was now first and foremost a member of the faculty of the College and as such was absolutely true to the Board of Trustees' order and the faculty's effort to have it obeyed in every particular. Naturally enough, she suffered the scorn of many of her own sorority friends. But, whatever happened, she was absolutely true to her College trust.

In all the many and varied relations that a Dean of Women of a Christian college has with students, faculty, trustees, and friends, I found Miss Hughes proved most satisfactory.

During the last year of my administration I feared that we were to lose her, and when she asked whether I had been satisfied with her services, I replied that I was.

I do not hesitate to recommend Miss Hughes to any college needing the service of a Dean of Women. She is a woman of scholarly attainments, a fine teacher, a strong and attractive personality, never loses her head, sympathetic, but not hysteric, a strong, worthy and sincere Christian.

I shall be willing to answer any inquiries concerning her.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS EDWARD HOLDEN.

We give also a signed letter written by a member of the senior class to one of the trustees when it became known that Miss Hughes had been dismissed:

HOLDEN HALL, WOOSTER, OHIO.

February 1, 1916.

My dear Dr. Higley:

I am sending this to you because you are a trustee and I hope you will understand that I do not mean to be impertinent. I heard last week quite by accident that Miss Hughes is to be dismissed. I didn't believe it at first, it seemed so preposterous, but since, I have learned that, impossible as it seems, it is true. Now I know that, being a student, my feeling about the matter is not at all likely to carry any weight, and yet I have been here four years and Wooster seems to belong to me as much as to anyone and some way that gives me a right to be interested in her affairs and to protest when I don't like them.

I was here for three months the year before Miss Hughes came and I *know* that her influence has made a great difference among the women at Wooster. I am a fraternity girl and hated her at first. I felt that she was responsible for the loss of my fraternity and I resented her supervision. We had been a bit ungoverned the year before, we had enjoyed it and we resented any innovation. We made things as hard, as uncomfortable, and as unpleasant as a number of bitter, angry girls could do. We wouldn't let her show us that she meant to be fair, we didn't believe it, and we wouldn't see that she was trying to put herself in our places and be sympathetic, we didn't wish to. As I look back upon that year, I am very much ashamed of our behavior and I wonder how she ever endured it. But she did and gradually we forgot our bitterness at what we had thought she was in our admiration for what she showed herself to be.

I know whereof I speak when I say that she has utterly changed the spirit among the girls. They no longer stay out until after closing time and crawl in

the windows. To be sure the general spirit is such that the girls would not tolerate it, but it is Miss Hughes who has made this spirit. I *know* for I have seen its evolution through four years. For four years it has been my privilege to know our present Dean of Women and whatever the action of the Board, I am glad from the bottom of my heart that she has been here during my course, and to know that she will not be here will take away much of the joy of coming back as an alumna.

These letters do not exaggerate the difficulties of the new Dean's position. And apparently it has not been denied by anybody that Miss Hughes brought about a great improvement in the material and social conditions of student life in the dormitories. She seems to have been appointed in the first place because certain students could not be controlled, and she put an end to horse-play, vulgarity, sneakiness, and grave improprieties.

One competent and fair-minded witness says:

There is no doubt about the change in Holden Hall since Miss Hughes came there. The girls have a finer idea of the proprieties and are most honest. Miss Hughes has put forth more efforts than ever before to make their lives homelike. . . . When Miss Hughes came here she said that if she could not be anything else she could be a buffer, and she has been one. . . . Many of the girls opposed to her were not of the finest type.

Thus the struggle for propriety and the fraternity trouble left Miss Hughes with student enemies. There seems also to be little doubt that one of the house matrons referred to by President Holden created a considerable amount of sentiment against her in certain influential circles to which she had access.

THE ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING

When Miss Hughes was offered the Wooster position she hesitated about leaving a place in which she was successful and had every prospect of a permanent position, to undertake new responsibilities: "If I have these gifts," she wrote to President Holden, "and you can teach me to use them effectively, all will be well. If I should not have this power you would soon not want me and I would be in the position of a man I know, out of that work, and unable to go back into teaching." President Holden replied, January 23, 1911, notifying her of her election and adding the following sentences:

The recommendation was unanimously adopted. I am therefore given authority to call you to the University of Wooster at once, and I should be glad if it were possible for you to arrange to report for service February 1. Your headquarters

will be my office. It is our custom to make all calls for one year unless otherwise specified, with the understanding that the position is to be permanent if there is mutual satisfaction. . . . I believe that it will not take a year for you to prove to yourself and to the Board of Trustees the wisdom of your appointment. While it is a risk, as you say, for you and for us, for you to undertake this work, I am perfectly confident from our standpoint that the risk will be worth the taking. Should either of us come to the conclusion after a year that we had made a mistake, then I should hope that there would be work in the teaching line in the department in which you have been so successful. I think you have special gifts in the line to which I am inviting you and I believe that I can in a brief space of time give you such points as will make your gifts effective. I realize that I am the one that is choosing you for the work and that you are not coming to us under any false pretenses. You are coming to Wooster on my initiative and not yours. If the plan fails, it is my failure and not yours.

I trust that your President in view of this present opening at Wooster in your own Alma Mater, will be willing to surrender you to us with God's blessing and that you may be on hand February 1 to undertake the work.

With my sincere regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

L. E. HOLDEN,
President.

Miss Hughes says that in April, 1912, President Holden sent for her and told her that they wanted her to be Dean of Women. "In effect he said that the year of work had shown them what I was and now they wanted me to take up this other much needed work. The appointment was without term and with the presumption that it would last as long as I rendered good service. I assumed the duties of Dean of Women, September 1, 1912. The beginning of the College year 1913, I added the duties of Instructor in History of Art to my other work. This was a definite appointment made, as I understand, by the executive committee, the year before."

CHARGES AGAINST DEAN HUGHES AND THE ATTITUDE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

When the administration was called upon to defend its action in dismissing Dean Hughes, it made various charges against her, and four and a half months later, when the committee of inquiry began to investigate, the thing most emphasized by President White and members of the executive committee was that she was "nervous" and that her nervousness had a bad effect on others.

When Dean Hughes heard of this charge against her she was most anxious that the committee of inquiry should get into touch with

various persons whom she named and who, she thought, were in a position to give evidence on the subject. But it seemed to the committee that nothing was to be gained by its attempting to weigh the evidence of her friends against that of her opponents. That was something that might well have been done by the administration. The committee of inquiry, therefore, did not communicate with any of the persons to whom Miss Hughes requested it to write, and Mr. Aikins declined to meet various mothers of students to whom she was anxious to introduce him. Miss Hughes was certainly not hysterical. But it is possible that she was over-conscientious and at times she seems to have shown a certain amount of tension. The committee does not know whether this was more or less serious than one might reasonably expect to find in a woman between forty and fifty years of age, housed with a hundred girls in a dormitory, doggedly carrying through difficult reforms, enforcing legislation which was bitterly resented, and trying to create finer student ideals at a time when the whole College atmosphere was full of long-continued conflict and bitterness and contained much that was very far from ideal. "Remember," said one impartial witness, "not one of us down here has been normal in the last two years."

Certain things, however, are clear:

1. Whatever defects Miss Hughes may have had, they were not sufficient to interfere with the very high esteem in which she was held by President Holden and Dean Compton, who knew far more about her and her work than anybody else; to say nothing of her former colleagues and superiors at Mount Holyoke, and the great majority of her colleagues in the Wooster faculty, who petitioned twice that she be retained.

2. Neither President White nor any other member of the executive committee had ever brought her supposed "nervousness" (or any other defect) to the attention of Miss Hughes herself. This statement is based on the testimony of Miss Hughes, of President White, and of four other members of the executive committee (Messrs. Shupe, Weir, Wishard and Heron), who all agree on the point.

3. If one may judge by a contemporary letter (January 8) this "nervousness" was not the thing that her friends on the faculty believed would be alleged in defence of her dismissal.

4. It was not the thing actually mentioned (between January 7 and January 28, 1916) as the cause of her dismissal by the member

of the executive committee who gave the first explanation of the dismissal to a member of the faculty (Dean Compton).

5. It was not mentioned by President White on January 28 to faculty members who asked for a reason for the dismissal. At that time he implied that he had something very serious against her, but he would not say what it was.

All this seems to indicate that the "nervousness" or whatever one may call it, which was accented most by the executive committee five months after it had sent Dean Hughes her letter of dismissal, was neither the cause of the dismissal nor such an outstanding and serious defect as to be generally recognized as a legitimate ground for dismissal.

When the committee of inquiry asked President White to explain the reasons for Dean Hughes' dismissal, he charged her not only with nervousness but with various other defects. These charges, as made by President White, appear to the committee of inquiry to leave an entirely erroneous impression of the situation, and inasmuch as they seem to have had nothing to do with the final disposition of the case they are hardly worth repeating. It should be added that President White's charges were not made immediately upon the receipt of the committee's letter of inquiry in May, but only after President White had taken time to send out a large number of letters asking for evidence or "opinion" against her. We shall have more to say about these letters later.

To return to the executive committee. It has, or had, nine members besides President White, and four of the nine appear to have had very little to do with the determination of its policies.* Four of the other five were interviewed and the committee of inquiry has a letter from the fifth. At least two of the five (Mr. Shupe and Dr. Hills) appear to have wanted an entirely different type of woman from the beginning, "a motherly housemother to whom the girls could go with all the more intimate things of their life," preferably "a woman who was herself a mother," like the one they had in Holden Hall before a Dean of Women was appointed. It is possible also that Dean Hughes' appointment had been carried through and the arrangements made by President Holden without as much deference to the opinions of the local trustees as some of them would have liked. Dr. Hills, now president of the Board, says that it had always been his conviction, often expressed

*Messrs. McClellan, Alanson Palmer, Foss, and Schwartz.

to Dr. Holden, that the Dean of Women should not be domiciled in either dormitory. Mr. Shupe says, "Miss Hughes' appointment was made by Dr. Holden and I suppose it went through the regular forms. But I thought it was a mistake and have thought so ever since." A third local trustee, Dr. Wishard, says, "The appointment of Miss Hughes was forced on us. I did not agree with the method of appointment. I was new on the Board and did not oppose it. . . . She was a great friend of Dr. Holden's, and, I think, of Mr. Severance."*

If there was dissatisfaction at the time of Dean Hughes' appointment no intimation of it was given to her, and no member of the executive committee ever told her that they thought anything was wrong. Within the executive committee itself no effort seems to have been made to find some adjustment by which the College might profit from her virtues without suffering from her supposed deficiencies. For example, her supposed "nervousness" was spoken of almost entirely in connection with her residence in Holden Hall, yet no one seems to have suggested after Dr. Holden left that she should live elsewhere, in spite of Dr. Hills' convictions; and though both Mr. Shupe and Dr. Wishard said they thought that there was nothing in Miss Hughes' "nervousness" to interfere with her success as a college teacher, no one seems to have suggested that it might be wise to give her a purely teaching position, as President Holden had practically promised to do in the event of dissatisfaction with her other work. Dr. Wishard said, "I am not the administrator of the College. It might have been a very sane thing to do." He adds, "I have nothing but kindness for Miss Hughes. She has been kind to my daughter. . . . The community regards it as a fight against Dr. White. Miss Hughes is only an incident."

In a written communication dated May 19, 1916, and transmitted through President White, one local trustee accuses Miss Hughes of taking an attitude toward the town girls and making remarks about them which "bordered upon the insulting," and from other sources the committee has heard an alleged remark of hers which student residents of Wooster might well resent. In reply to these charges Miss Hughes states most emphatically that she had never made any remarks of the sort, and that no member of the

*It is evident from the correspondence that up to the time of her appointment both men were comparative strangers to her.

Board had ever given her a chance to reply to the charge of making them until her hearing in June, when she traced one or more of them to their source. As to her attitude towards the people of the town, she maintains that from the time of her own undergraduate days she has had no feeling towards them but one of friendship and respect, that as Dean of Women she made it her business to see that town girls were invited to functions in the dormitories, and that it was her constant effort to do away with any antagonism between town and gown.

Apart from the charge just mentioned and from her management of the X case, which will be discussed presently, no member of the executive committee accused Miss Hughes to the committee of inquiry with any specific act of impropriety or bad judgment. No member of the executive committee had the slightest fault to find with her character; and so far as we know nobody connected with the institution has ever doubted that she did her work with faithfulness and devotion. All the trustees who were interviewed agreed that, so far as they knew, Miss Hughes (who had served as Dean of Women for nearly three and a half years before her letter of dismissal) had never been given any intimation whatever that there was any respect in which she was failing to give satisfaction.

One fault found with Miss Hughes had to do with religion. She is a member of the Presbyterian Church and appears to conform with all the usual observances. She says "I have always stood at Chicago and elsewhere for the distinctly religious side"; but in Wooster circles close to the present administration, her influence was not supposed to be sufficiently positive and it was charged that she lacked in "Christian leadership" (President White shared this view), was not "spirit filled," "did not talk to students about their inmost experiences," and had spent part of a certain week of prayer in Cleveland when Dr. White (not yet president) was conducting evangelistic services in Wooster, etc.*

When Rev. Dr. Weir, another member of the executive committee, and College pastor until the summer of 1916, was asked about this supposed lack of Christian aggressiveness on her part, he replied: "She was not removed on that account, yet it has been one of the current opinions here that she . . . but let Dr. White say it, I am her pastor."

*From the letters against her collected by President White, and the testimony of one of the writers.

President White testified that the lack of religious leadership, of which he had complained a year earlier (during Dr. Holden's presidency), was "not in the foreground" in the consideration of her dismissal. There can be no doubt that some such supposed defect counted against Miss Hughes with him and Dr. Weir and Dr. Hills. There is no evidence that any of them ever spoke to her about it. President Holden had no complaint to make against her on that score, as his letter shows.

Dr. Weir, who characterized Miss Hughes as "an admirable lady but too nervous," mentioned two events of a couple of years earlier that had a good deal to do with confirming his impression that she was not fitted for her position. One of these was that at that time the two small "cabinets" of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. had come to him about the great unrest existing amongst the students, and traced it to four causes: one of the four being the Dean of Women and her residence in Holden Hall.

Dr. Weir did not communicate this or any other criticism to Miss Hughes. Neither did he suggest to her at any time that there was any respect in which her work or her relations with the students could be improved.*

*And it is reasonably certain that these local trustees, who had never talked things over with Miss Hughes, did not know the difficulties with which she was confronted and that some of them did not understand her problems and had no great sympathy with her ideals. Yet one or another of them was likely to hear whatever might be said in criticism of her methods.

It may be added that under such conditions as exist at Wooster it is very difficult to know how far a trustee's attitude is the result of purely personal and business considerations. One witness testifies, for example, that after his appointment to a College position a local trustee solicited his bank account. One of the local trustees spoke to Mr. Aikins with some feeling about a member of the faculty who interfered, perhaps improperly or imprudently, in a matter which was under the speaker's professional charge. (This, by the way, was incidental and is not in the written evidence which was submitted to the witness for verification.) Miss Hughes believes that the unfavorable attitude towards her of the trustee who had the most to say about her "nervousness" was the result of a perfectly correct suggestion on her part which wounded his professional pride. One local trustee told Mr. Aikins with disapproval that "these fellows" (certain members of the faculty) had tried to get Dr. ——— (another local trustee) out of his church. It seems that the gentleman in question was pastor of the church which "these fellows" attended but had accepted another position without immediately resigning the pastorate and that some question had arisen as to his retention of the two positions. Another local trustee says it was his impression that the thing complained of in the X case, of which we are about to speak, was not Miss

THE WOMEN'S ADVISORY BOARD. THE X CASE

The second event of two years before which Dr. Weir said had had a good deal to do with confirming his impression of Miss Hughes' unfitness for her position, was a conversation with the President of the Women's Advisory Board of the College, who he said had urged upon him that the Trustees should take steps towards securing a new Dean of Women. Dr. Weir added, "It is now claimed that she has changed her mind. I do not know about it. She would not deny the interview with me."

The committee of inquiry did not investigate the story of this lady's conversation with Dr. Weir two years earlier, for one's estimate of a person may undergo very radical changes in the course of two years. It is enough to know that in January, 1916, she wrote a letter of the most indignant protest against the story that she was opposed to Dean Hughes. In this letter she speaks of Miss Hughes in the very highest terms and states that the Women's Advisory Board is "ignorant of the causes that have brought this trouble about."

A later event which weighed most heavily against Dean Hughes with Dr. Weir was her management of the X case—an exceedingly difficult situation which arose and was disposed of during the administration of President Holden. According to Dr. Weir, Miss Hughes took a course of action which was "absolutely unwarranted" and which he regarded as a "desperate break." This case fell properly within the jurisdiction of Dean Hughes, but she did not hear of it until Dr. Weir and a certain house matron, who should have had nothing to do with it, had taken certain steps in the matter which were natural enough in themselves, but really made a bad situation worse, and helped to leave a certain innocent person in as cruel a situation as could well be imagined. Others also were left in a condition of constant serious apprehension. When the matter was finally brought to the attention of Dean Hughes she took steps which put an end to the whole trouble. The steps were Hughes' management of the case itself, but the way in which she silently placed before another local trustee the evidence which seemed to her to show that his own action in the case had been unfortunate.

The reader is requested not to attach undue importance to any of these purely incidental statements about persons who have had no chance to reply to them, or to form an opinion of any individual on the strength of them. They are intended merely to illustrate the complications which are likely to arise when there is a considerable number of local trustees in close relations with a small college community and more or less dependent upon it.

unusual, and Dr. Weir and others disapproved. It should be added that Dr. Weir's own action had been taken at the request of a person who was indirectly interested, and that it might have been proper enough if the case had been as simple as he supposed and if he had taken the Dean of Women into his confidence. When Miss Hughes heard about the case she learned certain particulars of which Dr. Weir seems to have been entirely ignorant at the time when he formed his opinion of her action. It is these added particulars which made Dean Hughes' course of action necessary and made his own action in the matter unfortunate so long as it was not supplemented by hers.

Dr. Weir testified on May 31, 1916, that "that incident [the X case] had a great deal to do with forming my estimate of Miss Hughes' unfitness for such a responsibility." Another local trustee, Rev. Dr. Heron, said, June 1, "The very minute I heard of it I said 'That's enough.'" Both of these verbal statements are supported by written communications dated in May, 1916, and read by President White to the full Board of Trustees in June. Dr. White says (June 24) that Dr. Heron's statement about the influence of this incident upon his judgment was "not the whole story by any means"; and that is true. But the man himself says that the incident was decisive, and in his letter of May, 1916, he calls it her gravest offense.

In January no less than in May, Miss Hughes' management of the X case, and the supposed attitude of the Women's Advisory Board and its president, were both matters of great importance in the minds of one or more members of the executive committee of the Board. Under date of May 27, 1916, Dr. Compton, Dean of the College, writes as follows:

Replying to your question regarding a point of fact, I hereby certify that on a day between January 7 and 20, 1916, a member of the local executive committee of the Trustees of the College, called at my office. . . . He proceeded to give reasons which in his view, were weighty in determining the action that the executive committee had recently taken against Dean Hughes. (He had not conferred with me about this matter before the action was taken.) He emphasized two points and only two, so far as I recall; first, the judgment of the Women's Advisory Board and its president that Dean Hughes is not fitted for her position, and that a change ought to be made; second, the very bad judgment, as he insisted, which she had shown in her action last year in [the X case].

Regarding the first of the points, the trustee said that the Women's Board was urgent in its view that Miss Hughes is unsuited to her office and that its opposition reached back at least two years. He stated explicitly that the president of said board held the view mentioned. I do not pretend to quote his

words; I am certain of their purport, of his emphatic assertion of the adverse attitude of the Advisory Board and its president toward Miss Hughes' deanship, and of his purpose to impress upon me the point that this adverse attitude strongly influenced him and the executive committee.

Inquiries by me brought from two of the four local members of the Women's Advisory Board and from its president statements which convinced me that my trustee informant was in error regarding the mind of the board and its president; for the three members all affirmed that the question of Dean Hughes' fitness for her office was never raised by anyone in any meeting of the board; the two local members declared that the question had never been raised, to their knowledge, in any meeting of their board's executive committee; and two of the three, the president and one other,—have definitely declared their favorable attitude toward Miss Hughes' deanship, while the third, as I understand, has the same attitude. No other members of the Women's Advisory Board have expressed their own views to me, nor have I sought them.

Regarding the second of the two grounds of action mentioned by the trustee, I expressed to him my firm conviction that the action by Dean Hughes which he condemned was, under all the circumstances, the right and only adequate action. . . . I pointed out that the Dean's action was at once efficacious and was gratifying to the parties chiefly concerned, and that no other action suggested as an alternative would have met the case. He remarked that the action was at least very unusual—the interview did not bring us to agreement.

Two trustees have expressed to me their strong feeling that the course taken by Dean Hughes in the unhappy case to which allusion has been made, evinced unfitness for her position. Nevertheless it is my deliberate judgment that the action evinced rather an unusual competency. I stand for it.

Respectfully yours,

ELIAS COMPTON.

P. S. My reason for withholding the trustee's name is my feeling that he regarded his statements as confidential in regard to their source, though not in regard to their content.

It should be added that Dean Compton knew all the facts in the X case. In view of later developments his statements of fact in regard to the attitude of members of the executive committee of the Board of Trustees are important. And since we shall have occasion to quote him again, it may as well be stated here that he is a man whose uprightness, fair-mindedness, and studious accuracy of statement no one would question. His brother is married to Dr. White's sister; he was opposed to an investigation by the Association; and he has shown a spirit of the utmost consideration towards the new administration.

Another witness, a lady who knew some of the facts in the X case before Miss Hughes knew anything at all about it, and who understood the conditions under which Miss Hughes had acted, says: "No one blames her for her action in the case. Miss Hughes

did the only thing she could—no one blames her.” This witness is friendly to the present administration and is one of the persons called upon by the President to give evidence against Miss Hughes.

Another lady closely connected with the College, who did not know all the facts in the case until after Miss Hughes’s final dismissal by the Board in June, writes that, having heard the whole story, she cannot understand why the Trustees of the College “did not go down on their knees to Miss Hughes” for her action in the case; and her feelings about the matter appear to the committee of inquiry to be entirely appropriate. This committee is in possession of far more evidence than any of Miss Hughes’ judges ever had, and it is clear that the situation was more complex than her critics realized. Her action was prompt, courageous, honest, conclusive. It was absolutely satisfactory to the principal parties concerned, and secured comfort and peace of mind for others. It was approved by President Holden, in whose administration it occurred, and was of unquestionable service to the College. In our judgment, Dean Compton is quite right in saying that it evinced unusual competency. We regret that it is not wise to publish the whole story. Suffice it to say that neither of these two trustee critics, nor President White nor any other member of the executive committee ever asked Miss Hughes or the other principal party concerned for a full account of a case that seemed to certain members of the committee to weigh so heavily against her. Indeed, two different members of the committee have prided themselves on their failure to get first-hand information about it.

THE VISITING COMMITTEE

In the formal defense of Dean Hughes’ dismissal which he gave to the committee of inquiry on May 31, 1916, President White says: “A visiting committee of the Board of Trustees in February, 1915, received so many complaints about Miss Hughes that they were on the point of recommending then that her services be discontinued, but decided finally to let the matter wait for later action. But they knew that the situation was highly unsatisfactory, and could not long be allowed to continue.”

Visiting committees are appointed in June and report in the following February. It appears that Dr. White was himself chairman of this committee and stated at the time to Dean Compton that Miss Hughes was not the religious leader that Mrs. ——— was and that she had shown unspeakably bad judgment in the X case.

He states that he got his information about the case from Dr. Weir. Another member of the visiting committee was Rev. D. A. Heron of Wooster (a member of the executive committee). He states that the very minute he heard of Miss Hughes' management of the X case he said "That's enough"—*i. e.* the case against Miss Hughes. When asked whether any member of the executive committee had gone to either Miss Hughes or the person chiefly concerned for further information about the case, Dr. Heron replied with emphasis, "I didn't." His statements about the X case on June 1, 1916, show that he did not know the facts which made Dean Hughes's action necessary. The third member of the visiting committee was Rev. E. M. McMillan of Mansfield. He was not interviewed. But it is not claimed that any one of the three discussed this case or any other of her problems with Dean Hughes, or that they got first-hand information about the X case from any of the principals. Dr. White says, however, "I conferred with Dean Compton when I was here as chairman of the visiting committee and found that he thought that Miss Hughes was doing fairly well and ought to be kept."

President White's statement that the visiting committee were on the point of recommending Miss Hughes' dismissal is confirmed by Dr. Weir, who says they came very, very near recommending a change; just one person prevailed on them to let it rest—a member of the executive committee, on whose testimony they decided to let it wait. But the visiting committee never discussed the proposed dismissal of Miss Hughes with President Holden, though, as Dr. Weir states it, "their investigation was made prior to Dr. Holden's resignation and before it was anticipated that he would resign." Dr. Weir says, "I don't know whether they consulted President Holden. As pastor I avoided the visiting committee. If they did not interview the President, I would surmise a reason; he was always committed to keeping Miss Hughes here and differed radically from these others."

President White testifies: "I did not confer then with Dr. Holden. I would have if we had not decided to drop the case." It may be added that without consulting President Holden, Dr. White's visiting committee did actually recommend at that time (February, 1915), that another person, an assistant professor, be dropped, and the Board instructed President Holden to notify the man that he had been dropped. It was at this same meeting of the Board that

Dr. White's normal school motion was made and passed and that Dr. Holden resigned.

THE ACTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The action of the executive committee, of which Dr. White became a member when he was elected to the presidency, like the proposed action of the visiting committee of which he was chairman the year before, took place without any hearing for Miss Hughes or any investigation of charges against her. Dr. Weir says:

I presume no member of the executive committee conferred with her and gave her a chance to present her side of the case before the committee took action. The woman could not be changed and is not the kind that would enter helpfully into such a conference. There was a great amount of evidence in hand that had been accumulating for years. Her friends were not called in before the executive committee, though I had gone over the case with her friends, *e.g.* Dean Compton. We did not agree about it. There was no one in the committee meeting to represent her in any way, but the men of the committee went into the matter in the most careful way and the best spirit.

Mr. Shupe's account of how they went into the matter is as follows:

We of the executive committee who are on the ground and know much of what is going on have never had any doubt that in that position Miss Hughes is a misfit; and when the question came up in the Board [*i.e.* the "Little Board" or executive committee] no discussion on that head was necessary. The only question in our mind was how to get rid of her in the kindest way possible without interfering with her chance of getting a position elsewhere. . . . Miss Hughes' management of the X case is something that I know nothing about. I took pains not to hear anything about the dirty business. So far as the executive committee was concerned our minds were made up anyway. I did not know the facts as you state them.

Two local trustees, Mr. Geo. Schwartz and Mr. W. D. Foss, were absent from the meeting that settled the fate of Miss Hughes. Dr. Weir testifies however, that Mr. Foss said he did not have enough first-hand information to form a judgment on her case. Mr. Schwartz testified that he himself knew nothing against Miss Hughes until the X case was brought up against her in the full Board and that he believed the other charges, of nervousness, etc., were merely trumped up after her dismissal to cover an accomplished fact.

It will be remembered that in 1914-15 the initiative in regard to Miss Hughes was taken by the visiting committee, of which Dr. White was chairman. A year later, when the executive committee wrote its letter to Dean Hughes, there was a new visiting commit-

tee, but apparently it took no action in the case of Dean Hughes; the executive committee itself took the initiative, apparently on the instigation of President White who "proposed that we must have a new Dean of Women and gave his reasons and outlined his method." (Dr. Weir.)

THE POINT OF VIEW OF PRESIDENT WHITE

Dr. White was not a resident of Wooster until after his election to the presidency, though he had family connections in the city and Mr. Shupe, his wife's brother-in-law, was on the Board. When he accepted the call he wrote for the *Wooster Republican*: "It is well understood by all concerned that my relation to the National Missionary campaign this winter remains practically unchanged. I intend to be present at as many conventions as anyone else will attend and assist in every possible way in what I expect to be the most remarkable series of religious conventions ever yet held." (*Why I accepted*, etc.)

In accordance with this understanding President White spent much time away from Wooster and saw very little indeed of Miss Hughes or her work. He certainly never talked things over with her either as chairman of the visiting committee or as President, or pointed out to her the respects in which he thought her work could be improved. He states that as soon as he decided to accept the presidency—in July, 1915,—he "took every opportunity of consulting alumni about any changes that ought to be made in the staff. I inquired about it from many different people* and never got any other judgment from any of the alumni about Miss Hughes' unfitness for the position." Moreover, "I am mingling with the students constantly. In a small community like this every one knows everything about everybody"; and as chairman of the visiting committee of the year before, he had "heard all sorts of reports about her incompetence." It is not claimed that he ever investigated these reports. He certainly never saw Miss Hughes and talked things over, either as chairman of the visiting committee or as President. He did not point out to her her supposed defects

*President White has not made any definite statement as to the number of persons consulted. It is stated that he lived near New York City, where there are very few of the younger Wooster alumni and where there were no alumni meetings at that time, and that he did not move to Wooster until the latter part of August. None of the letters against Miss Hughes which he afterwards gave the Committee of Inquiry contains any reference to inquiries made by the President at this time.

because he "considered her deficiencies too deep for her to change." He had known her in College twenty-five years before [though he had seen very little of her since] and all that he heard confirmed an impression that he had from old acquaintance with her that she was not the sort of person to be in that kind of a position. He assumed that President Holden's opinion of her was favorable, and he did not believe that she had changed since the end of the Holden administration (June, 1915). "It is simply a question of a radical difference of opinion. He was responsible for his administration, I for mine. There is a general impression that Dr. Holden saw her strong points, not her weak ones."*

*President White's statement from which the foregoing summary is made is as follows (May 31, 1916):

"There was no conference whatever with Miss Hughes [before her dismissal]. That probably would have been the proper course though it wouldn't probably have changed the final action."

Q. "Have you seen much of her?"

A. "I have known her since I was in college and would not have to see any more of her than I had the chance to see in order to form a judgment. I know this from my knowledge of her whole temperament, and then I was chairman of the visiting committee and heard all sorts of reports about her incompetence at that time.

"I did not see her and talk things over at that time. We didn't come to the point of recommending her dismissal, but what I heard confirmed an impression that I had from my old acquaintance with her that she was not the sort of person to be in that kind of a position and of course, it was being supported by reports that have been reaching me all the time,—ever since I knew that I was to be here—last July, I decided to come.

"As soon as I decided to come, I took every opportunity of consulting alumni about any changes that ought to be made in the staff. I inquired about it from many different people and have never got any other judgment from any of the alumni about Miss Hughes's unfitness for her position. No, they didn't know what I felt about it, but I did carry a strong impression from student days.

"I did not talk with her about her faults because I considered the deficiencies too deep for her to change. I did not try to get her story. In dismissing her in the way in which we did, we thought we were doing it in the gentlest way we knew how."

Q. "Did you see much of her work?"

A. "I never was in her classroom, but the evidences of her work are all about. I am mingling with the students constantly. In a small community like this you know everything about everybody.

"I assume President Holden's opinion of her was favorable. I do not think she has changed since then. It is simply a question of a radical difference of opinion. That is easy to account for. He was responsible for his administration, I for mine. There is a general impression that Dr. Holden saw her strong points, not her weak ones."

On September 23, 1916, three months after her final dismissal, Miss Hughes sent the committee of inquiry certain letters from Dean Compton and President Holden, with the following personal comment:

These two letters are a great comfort to me because the only people who really knew anything of what I had to meet, and to endure, and to change, and to carry through were Dean Compton and President Holden. They were always both so *fine* in every way. . . . Dean Compton knew the details [of work] and again and again he listened as I discussed all those things with him, because I wanted his point of view. I wanted to be *sure* to be just and fair and not to be swayed by anything that might be tinged with personal feeling. . . . Dr. Holden, I did not trouble with details, but he knew in general my work. Nothing did I ever keep from either of those men, and never did anyone have truer or more faithful and loyal friends than those two men have always been to me.

THE LETTER OF DISMISSAL

The letter which Miss Hughes received from the executive committee was as follows:

806 College Avenue, Wooster, Ohio, January 1, 1916.

MISS WINONA HUGHES,

Marion, Ohio.

My dear Miss Hughes:

I have been asked by the executive committee of the Board of Trustees to write to you concerning your future relation to the College. The committee deeply appreciate all you have done for the College, and have all confidence in your devotion and loyalty to the institution. They believe you are faithfully serving the College to the very best of your ability, and they desire to give you full credit for all that you have accomplished.

It is in the desire to take you into our confidence at as early a date as possible, that we feel that we ought to let you know now that some changes in the organization of the College next year are contemplated by which considerable economies may be effected. These changes involve the uniting of the functions of the Dean of Women with another important department of the College work requiring special technical preparation.

Under these circumstances it seems to us that we should let you know at the earliest possible moment that we are not likely to require your services after the close of this college year. We deeply appreciate your spirit of helpfulness, and will be glad to do anything in our power to assist you in finding any new work which you may be disposed to undertake, and we hope we may always retain your loyal co-operation.

In the nature of the case we would be glad if this communication might be regarded as confidential.

By order of the Executive Committee,

O. A. HILLS,
President of the Board of Trustees.

President White says this letter was drafted by him and revised by the executive committee.

It will be remembered that the acts of the executive committee are subject to review by the full Board, and a rule of the Board required that a copy of the executive committee's minutes be sent to every member of the Board who is not also a member of the executive committee. The minute on the Hughes case which they put on their books and sent to their fellow trustees was as follows:

It was decided to request the president of the Board of Trustees to communicate with Miss Hughes the attitude of the Board [sic] with regard to her position next year.

How the dismissal of Dean Hughes was regarded by most of her colleagues can be inferred from the following paragraphs written by one of them on January 8, 1916:

Miss Winona Hughes, our Dean of Women, received a New Year's letter from Rev. O. A. Hills, D.D., president of the Board, saying that the Executive Committee had decided that it must economize next year. They needed to unite her work with some technical work, having the two done by one person. Therefore, they would not need her services probably after the close of this year. The opening paragraph of the letter was a very commendatory one.

The following items of opinion may be interesting in this connection.

1. Miss Hughes was brought here from Mount Holyoke several years ago, giving up an important position in the Chemistry Department there.
 2. She has worked a fine transformation in the girls of the student body here. We used to have sneaking of all kinds before she came.
 3. She has worked well with Dean Compton. He supports her entirely.
 4. She has not always been popular with the girls. At least some of the leaders have not liked her. This is probably the reason why she is being dismissed.
 5. She was a member of the majority. It is hardly conceivable that she would be dismissed if she were a member of the minority. Yet she has not been opposed to the Administration in any way.*
 6. A little over a year ago she was offered a fine position paying twice as much as she gets here.† She refused it for love of Wooster.
- Some of the majority feel like doing something about it.

* It should be said, however, that Dean Hughes was one of those who advised Dr. White not to accept the presidency. She told him in homely phrase that he was likely to act upon precipitate judgment.

† It was not an offer. The President of the college in question came to Wooster and talked with her about the place. She refused to consider it, in spite of the larger salary, after receiving President Holden's assurances that her work at Wooster was perfectly satisfactory to him.

At the same time another member of the faculty wrote as follows:

When our troubles commenced last year Miss Hughes consistently stuck by Dr. Holden and his ideals, and from that position she has never swerved. Now she is dismissed on a trumped up reason of economy. Of course, if pressed her enemies will bring certain charges against her. She has made more than an average success in the eyes of Dean Compton and the rest of us. She has done a great deal for the College in the way of creating standards of behavior for the women. She is very strict and for this reason she is not popular with all the girls. Furthermore she does not stand for the kind of emotional religion now in vogue here. These are the two charges that will be brought against her here, but we all could be dismissed on as good or better grounds, beginning from the President down to Dickason. The real ground for this action is that Miss Hughes was opposed to Dickason, etc. I have it on absolutely sure grounds that another person is doomed to go, also a faithful adherent of high ideals. . . . If the Board sustains the local committee about Miss Hughes, I shall feel that it has done something that no Christian college should do. It will wreck the career of a fine woman, and act with absolute injustice. How can a man be loyal to a college that does such things? Is Wooster going to be the college that does such things, or can we hope that it will swing back to the ideals of justice, high scholarship and lofty ideals, avoiding all loud self-advertising and giving that freedom to the professors which allows the full development of personality?

The Reverend A. P. Higley is a graduate of Wooster who was appointed to the Board of Trustees by the Synod of Ohio in October, 1915. He permits us to quote the following paragraphs from his own notes of the case.

On Monday, January 10th, . . . I went to Wooster. And after a conference with Dean Compton, in which he set forth the excellent work done by the Dean [Hughes] and told me of the attitude of the majority of the faculty, I went to President White.

After some preliminaries, I asked him why it was that the executive committee had determined to make the retrenchments indicated by Dr. Hills's letter, and why he had been taking on workers for the College, as it seemed to some of us, rather unnecessarily. He replied: "Dr. Higley, you know that this is not the real cause for the dismissal of Dean Hughes." Then I asked, "What is it?" He said; "Her unfitness for the place." Then I suggested that the letter did not tell the truth. The President remarked that it was not wise to make this statement.

Some days later, I received the report of the action of the executive committee, and in that, there was neither an intimation that Miss Hughes was to be dismissed, or the cause of her dismission—which I suppose was to carry out the idea of Dr. Hills's letter, viz; "In the nature of the case we would be glad if this communication might be regarded as confidential."

In his formal account of the reasons for Dean Hughes' dismissal presented to the committee of inquiry on May 31, 1916, President White says:

The appreciation expressed by the executive committee in its letter to Miss Hughes was perfectly genuine, but it said nothing whatever about her success as a Dean of Women. The reason given in that letter for discontinuing Miss Hughes' services was also perfectly genuine, though by no means the only reasons in the mind of the committee. It was not thought necessary or appropriate to point out all of her weaknesses, in telling her that her services would not be required after the present college year.

President White stated verbally that a second consideration leading to her discharge was that she was "only doing three hours' teaching while the Dean of Men does fifteen."

During the summer of 1916 a new Dean of Women was appointed. She teaches only English Constitutional History, three hours a week. Moreover, there has been no "uniting of the functions of the Dean of Women with another important department of the college work requiring special technical preparation." (See the letter to Miss Hughes.)

PROTECTING MISS HUGHES

When President White was asked by Mr. Aikins about the minute on the records he said: "The whole case was not outlined on the record. It was not thought necessary to go into it until the whole Board could meet. It was purposely vague—to protect her."

As to the request that she regard the communication from the executive committee as confidential he said: "She was not asked to keep quiet about it except for her own sake. They wanted to give her the opportunity of seeming to resign spontaneously." (Interview of May 31, 1916.)

Another criticism brought against the executive committee within the Board itself was that in acting as they did a few weeks before the regular meeting of the full Board, at the beginning of February, they usurped its functions unnecessarily. In his formal statement President White says:

The only reasons why action in Miss Hughes' case was taken by the executive committee instead of waiting to have action taken by the entire Board, were out of genuine consideration for Miss Hughes herself. (1) That unnecessary publicity might be avoided, and she be allowed to withdraw quietly without having her limitations discussed. (2) That she be given as long notice as possible of her discontinuance. (3) That the notice might not be given her while at her work but during the vacation period.

Dr. Weir makes a similar statement:

The claim is that the executive committee has always dealt with these delicate cases to avoid publicity before a board of thirty men. . . . This publicity is very damaging to Miss Hughes in her future educational work. It is distinctly the thing to avoid. I am afraid she is the victim of others, rather than herself responsible for this course of events—for all the publicity from the beginning to now. We were very anxious to avoid it, in her interest, distinctly so.

Mr. Shupe also thought that in her own interest Miss Hughes should have gone quietly, though he did not volunteer any statement as to why action was taken by the executive committee.

THE FIRST FACULTY PETITION

The first intimation given to any member of the faculty by any member of the Board as to why Miss Hughes was to be dismissed seems to have been contained in the conversation, already mentioned, between Dean Compton and the member of the local executive committee, who emphasized two points and only two as weighty in determining the action of the committee, namely, the supposed judgment of the Women's Advisory Board and its president, and Miss Hughes' action in the X case.

Some time after this conversation, a petition was prepared by faculty members, and on the evening of January 28, seven of them presented it to President White. We give, first, part of a letter written before the event, which tells the intentions of the petitioners, next a copy of that part of the petition which has to do with Dean Hughes, then part of a letter written the day afterwards which tells how the President accepted the petition, and finally a joint statement on this point from all seven of the petitioners, and six separate supplementary statements prepared for the committee of inquiry.

LETTER PRECEDING PRESENTATION OF PETITION

WOOSTER, January 23, 1916.

My dear——

After considerable discussion our people have decided to pursue a rather mild course towards the case of Miss Hughes. We are going to have a conference with the President and ask him to have the case of Miss Hughes reconsidered, and we are going to urge upon him the need of adopting the by-law that we are proposing, which will give the faculty a hand in appointing and dismissing instructors. All is going to be done in good form and no pressure is going to be applied. The only question is whether such a plan will get any results.

COPY OF FIRST PART* OF PETITION PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT WHITE

WOOSTER, OHIO, January 27, 1916.

TO PRESIDENT J. CAMPBELL WHITE, LL.D.

College of Wooster.

Dear President White:

We, the undersigned, desire respectfully to present to you two petitions and our reasons therefor:

First, that you use your influence to secure at the meeting of the Board of Trustees on February 1 a reconsideration of the action of the executive committee of the Board relative to Dean Hughes.

Second, that you use your influence to obtain favorable consideration by the Board at the same meeting of what we believe to be desirable additions to the by-laws of the College of Wooster regulating the appointment, promotion, removal, and tenure of position of members of the teaching staff of the College.

1. In the matter pertaining to Dean Hughes we urge consideration of the following reasons:

We believe that Miss Hughes has discharged the duties of her office with fidelity and success. The office of Dean of Women in this College was created when she was called to it. She has lived and wrought through the first and most trying years of her position with what we believe to be marked efficiency and acceptability; most difficult administrative adjustments have been successfully effected and the wrinkles smoothed out; she has a stronger hold on the situation than ever before; and she is on the way to an even larger service than she has rendered hitherto, provided she receives due support. When Miss Hughes entered upon her work as Dean, she had to deal with a situation honeycombed with sneakiness and deceit in the dormitories for women, Holden Hall especially, a situation before which the matron was helpless, the particulars of which can be stated if such statement be necessary to establish the indubitable but unpleasant fact. As touching the efficiency of Miss Hughes as Dean the outstanding fact is that the morale in the dormitories, Holden Hall more particularly, has been transformed and the evils corrected under her influence, so that there is now practically no exception to the habit of truthfulness and straightforwardness among the young women.

Moreover, the halls of residence have constantly been made more attractive; the service is satisfactory; the conditions for study have been much improved; the health of the young women is cared for watchfully and competently; they have constant and capable training in good form and the habit of handling themselves with poise; they are happy and are doing satisfactory college work.

We have confidence in Miss Hughes; not only in her character but also in her fidelity, competency, and fitness for her position. We have come to know her strength in trying situations and her indefatigable devotion. That her record here and in other institutions is fitted to inspire respect and confidence is indicated by the fact that last year the president of ——— College, after a search over the country and an investigation of Miss Hughes' record and qualifications offered her the position of ——— at ——— at twice the salary she received here. She declined the offer out of sheer loyalty to her work here, not because she finds her

* The second part has to do with the matters mentioned in the paragraph beginning with the word "Second."

work easy, but because, though hard, she regards it as immensely worth while. When a college has a servant like that, true to her task and giving her life to it, the college should have a clear case of failure against her before it proceeds to dismissal with its inevitable disastrous consequences to her future career. In our judgment no such failure can be made out in Miss Hughes' case.

We are aware that there have been criticisms of Dean Hughes. But no college executive officer with large responsibilities for order and discipline can hope to escape criticism. Not long ago one of the most distinguished and successful of state university presidents said to a friend that he had no doubt that the right persons could get the names of two thousand students on a petition for his removal. With all the various antecedents and habits, tastes and temperaments, of the young women in our halls and of the people outside among whom they move; with all the love of social freedom on the part of college girls; with all the group opinions and sentiments; and with all the problems of social and household administration, as well as of faculty discipline, that pertain to her office; it is impossible for any woman, however gifted, to live with so many college girls intimately in their hall of residence as the head of their house and also the college officer primarily responsible for their discipline—all this in a coeducational institution—and to do her duty faithfully without criticism and opposition. The woman who undertakes such a work and achieves in it so large a measure of success as Miss Hughes has by her courage, loyalty, and ability achieved, deserves to have her hands held up until her incompetency is clearly established.

It is for such reasons that we respectfully urge you to endeavor to assure a reconsideration of the action of the executive committee with respect to Dean Hughes, in order that, unless the evidence after full investigation shall prove clearly sufficient to establish unfitness, she may be given opportunity to carry forward here the work which she has so much at heart.

ELLIS COMPTON, A.B., A.M., Ph.D. (Wooster).

Alumni Professor of Philosophy and Dean of the College.

JOHN B. KELSO, A.B. (Washington and Jefferson); Ph.D. (Leipsic).

Professor of Greek Language and Literature.

CLARENCE P. GOULD, A.B., Ph.D. (Johns Hopkins).

Michael O. Fisher Professor of History.

DELBERT G. LEAN, A.B. (Lawrence University), Emerson College of Oratory.

Professor of Oratory.

THE REVEREND J. MILTON VANCE, A.B. (Lake Forest); B.D. (McCormick Seminary); Ph.D. (Jena).

Mercer Professor of Biblical Instruction.

ROSS P. THOMAS, B.S. (Case School of Applied Science).

Instructor of Mathematics and Mechanical Drawing.

RUTHERFORD H. HUNTER, A.B. (Yale); Graduate Work, Yale.

Professor in Physics.

WALTER E. PECK, A.B., A.M. (Hamilton College).

Assistant Professor in Rhetoric and English Composition.

H. WILHELM TAEUSCH, A.B. (Wooster).

Instructor in Rhetoric and English Composition.

CLETUS C. VAN VOORHIS, Ph.B. (Wooster).

Instructor in Physics.

- WILLIAM E. CHANCELLOR, A.B., A.M. (Amherst).
(Acting) Hoge Professor of Political Science.
- GERTRUDE GINGRICH.
Professor of German Language and Literature.
- THE REVEREND CHALMERS MARTIN, A.B., A.M., D.D. (Princeton).
Severance Professor of Old Testament Literature.
- HORACE N. MATEER, A.B., A.M. (Princeton); M.D. (Univ. of Pennsylvania);
Ph.D. (Wooster).
Professor of Biology.
- BENJAMIN H. WILLIER, B.S., Wooster.
Instructor in Biology.
- JOHN W. OLTHOUSE, A.B., A.M. (University of Michigan).
Assistant Professor of French and German.
- BENJAMIN F. YANNEY, A.B., A.M., (Mount Union College). University of
Chicago.
Johnson Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy.
- SAMUEL MORRIS, A.B., A.M. (Ohio State University).
Instructor in Chemistry.
- EMERY A. BAUER, B.S. (Colgate University); B. P. E. (International Y. M. C. A.
College).
Director of Physical Education.
- THE REV. CLINTON TYLER WOOD, A.B., A.M. (Princeton).
Severance Professor of Missions.
- BERNICE F. WIKOFF, B.S. (Ohio State University).
Director of Physical Education for Women.

The twenty-two persons who signed this petition constitute a very considerable majority of the faculty, and include eleven out of the fifteen regular full professors who were on active duty in the College at that time.*

CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNT OF THE RECEPTION OF THE PETITION

My dear—:

You will be interested to hear the last in the Wooster situation. Last night seven members of the faculty met White with our petition, signed by twenty-two members of the faculty. We had a very strenuous time for a couple of hours. Finally White delivered his ultimatum. In substance it was this. Either the faculty must give up the fight, or he would regard it as a complete break. We left White's and went to the home of another professor, making eight in all. Three of us were eager to continue the fight, feeling it was no time to stop, but the other five did not see their way clear to go on with the matter. I am ashamed to tell it to you, but as far as the faculty is concerned there will be no petition to the Trustees about Miss Hughes . . . and so as a faculty we are out of the struggle.

* That leaves out of account two men on leave of absence, the librarian emeritus, and two teachers in the Conservatory of Music, to whom the petition was not presented for signature.

. . . I hope you will not despise us too much in this matter. Some of us were willing to go to all lengths, but we did not feel like forcing men who had so much at stake and in some cases had nothing to fall back upon.

If anything is done from now on it will have to be done by trustees and not by professors. Dr. White absolutely refused to discuss the case of Miss Hughes with us.

* * * * *

Of course, we are not going to fight in *any* way. . . . As far as I can see, the Trustees must now save the College, and the less they have to do with the faculty the better. The faculty through the Dean has surrendered to the President and that seems to be the end of the matter. I have tried to put the situation clearly before you, without violating the spirit of our statement to Mr. White, and I hope I have done so.

JOINT STATEMENT PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INQUIRY

We, the undersigned, hereby certify, that in a conference between us and President White on January 28, 1916, when we presented to him a petition signed by twenty-two members of the teaching staff of the College Department for a reconsideration by the Trustees of the action of the executive committee looking to the dismissal of Dean Hughes, the President (1) denounced the petitioners (majority of the faculty) for caucus action on this and previous occasions and for proposing to send copies of this petition to the Trustees before their meeting on February 1; (2) declared that the circumstances reviewed by the conferees as matters which, according to statements of a trustee, weighed most heavily in the mind of the executive committee in its action against Dean Hughes had nothing to do with the action,—to wit, (a) the alleged opinion of the Woman's Advisory Board and its president that Miss Hughes is unfit for her position, and (b) the alleged grave mismanagement by Dean Hughes of [the X case]; and (3) declared that, if the petitioners went further, counterpetitions would at once be circulated; and (4) that if the petition went further the petitioners would be responsible for the embarrassment of the administration and the injury to the College from sensational press reports which would inevitably result from the further agitation.

(Note. The petition had, before presentation, been submitted for signature to every member of the college teaching staff, exclusive of teachers in the Conservatory of Music and two instructors employed for this year only.)

(Signed) ELIAS COMPTON, Dean and Professor of Philosophy.

B. F. YANNEY, Professor of Mathematics.

CLARENCE P. GOULD, Professor of History.

JOHN B. KELSO, Professor of Greek.

R. H. HUNTER, Professor of Physics.

DELBERT G. LEAN, Professor of Oratory.

J. MILTON VANCE, Mercer Professor of Biblical Instruction.

The committee of inquiry put certain questions to the several makers of the above statement. All answered, and all the answers but one (which was not available at the time and from which no quotation is here made) were submitted to President White.

All agree that President White's language on this occasion was not temperate or such as to convey the impression that he took a judicial attitude towards Miss Hughes or a respectful attitude towards the petitioners. "He spoke with vehemence, especially in the early part of the interview." His language "was intemperate in the extreme." There was "little suggestion of judicial attitude towards Miss Hughes." "He was in no way personally abusive, but he seemed to look upon us as outsiders interfering in a matter that did not concern us." "We were given to understand that we were outside of our proper bounds." "The President's attitude towards us was one of intimidation, and with our best efforts in a conference of more than two hours we were unable to get any reason for the proposed dismissal of Miss Hughes . . . the President could not be forced by us to discuss the case on its merits or from the standpoint of justice." "It certainly was a very vivid impression in our minds that we had acted in *his* judgment in a way that was contemptible to present such a paper as we had or to present a petition about a matter that had already been decided. . . . His denunciation was based solely on the ground that we were presuming to ask the Trustees to reconsider Miss Hughes' case after it had been settled."

Three of the petitioners state that one reason given by the President for wishing the petition stopped was that it would lead to an agitation which would spoil all chance of getting a Phi Beta Kappa charter at the coming meeting of its council. He "said that our only hope of securing Phi Beta Kappa lay in harmony, and that if we had any disputes to bring up, to hold them still until after the meeting of that council." "The President felt that if it (the petition) were pushed it would provoke public discussion and break up the Board of Trustees. He said definitely that this would spoil all chances for getting a chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa."

As to the threatened counterpetition, the petitioners agree that President White did not say who would start one, "or how they would know of our petition or what would be put into a counterpetition." One of them states, however, "He implied that he would see to it himself." Another says, "My impression was that he had inside information." A third "gained the impression that it would come from the minority of the faculty (seven persons) and the teachers in the academy." Others asked afterwards "whether

anybody would really start a petition asking for Miss Hughes' dismissal, and if so on what grounds." "But the statement was very positive that there would be such petitions and that if this petition of ours was withdrawn he would see to it that no counterpetitions were started."

Six of the seven petitioners testify (the seventh is silent on the point) that President White *said or implied that he had information damaging to Dean Hughes which might be brought to light if the petitioners went further.* "The statement was clear by President White that if this thing came out, this petition, Miss Hughes would get all the publicity that she wanted. The clear inference was that he had some material against Miss Hughes that he would unload unless this petition was withdrawn. . . . He in no way intimated its nature except by telling us positively what it was *not*. He refused even in confidence to tell the Dean what it was." "President White did imply that he had very damaging information against Miss Hughes. I personally got the impression that he referred to her moral character. . . . One member of the committee did give up on this score, as he did not want to have Miss Hughes injured by any false rumors." "President White did say that he was in possession of evidence damaging to Miss Hughes. The nature of the evidence he would not disclose, but he said that if Miss Hughes wanted to call for the evidence she would get her fill of it. The reason for withholding the evidence, he said, was in order to protect Miss Hughes' reputation. The effect of this on some of the petitioners was, I felt, to make them hesitate and wonder whether there really was some damaging material that we knew nothing about. After that fear wore off, the feeling was that he had deliberately threatened to blacken the reputation of a lady in order to carry his point."

Though the petitioners "agreed to proceed no further with the petition as a group" it is perfectly obvious that every single one of them left the interview fully convinced of the injustice of the President's attitude. "The President unquestionably on the night of January 28 succeeded in intimidating the visiting committee. He advanced no arguments, he did not convince a single member of the committee, but he blustered and stormed for an hour or more, and then the committee as a whole decided to withdraw the petition." "In spite of the protest of some individuals the opinion of the majority was that the case of Miss Hughes was hopeless and had better

be given up, but that the President's offer to take up the proposed scheme for faculty advice in appointments and dismissals had better be accepted. The Dean [Compton] was consequently instructed to see the President the next day and suggest to him that we would not submit our petition, but that we would look to him to bring up the other matter in the Board of Trustees." "I regret to say that the petitioners made a great tactical mistake in my judgment. They dropped the case against my judgment and that of others, though they had not been changed in the slightest in their convictions. This enabled the President to go to the Board the next week and say to them—so I have been informed by one of the Trustees—that the faculty had been won around to his attitude to Miss Hughes and that they had given up her defense." This last statement has been confirmed to the committee of inquiry by a member of the Board.

President White's only comment on the above statements or others like them is this: "They sent a messenger to say that the whole petition was withdrawn." In an interview with Mr. Aikins on May 31 he said that he did not mean to leave the impression that there was anything against Miss Hughes' character. "I certainly never meant to give that impression. I certainly have never had anything of that sort."

President White's statement that if Miss Hughes wanted to call for the evidence she would get her fill of it was not altogether an idle threat, for a set of letters against Miss Hughes which he gave the committee of inquiry some three months later contained a copy of one written on Jan. 28 (the very day of this meeting with the petitioners) by a student who resided under Miss Hughes in Holden Hall. This student was interviewed, and testified that a few days before she wrote her letter President Wright had asked her to write out for him specific instances of things to the disadvantage of Miss Hughes, as he might have occasion to use such evidence against her at the approaching meeting of the Board. The girls' letter only mentioned one specific act and that was rather trivial; but in the light of her statements it is hard to avoid the conclusion that President White had been preparing to use student evidence against his Dean of Women at the very time that he objected strenuously to the presentation of a faculty petition in her favor.

THE FEBRUARY MEETING OF THE BOARD.

On February 1 (1916) came the regular semi-annual meeting of the Board, and Dr. Higley presented the following petition from Miss Hughes:

WOOSTER, OHIO, January 31, 1916.

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
The College of Wooster.

Gentlemen:

On January the third I received notice from the President of the Board that my services will probably not be required after the close of the present school year. Inasmuch as the reason set forth in the notice of this action has been denied by the President-elect of the College, and no other reason given, and a number of members of the faculty have sought in vain for such reason, I therefore respectfully petition that you investigate the charges leading to this action and grant me a hearing. I feel that I am entitled to know the grounds of the action and to have opportunity to answer to the charges against me as well as to rectify any false impressions that have been gained.

A copy of a petition from the faculty of the College to the President of the College is here presented.

Respectfully submitted

WINONA A. HUGHES.

In the meeting of the Board, President White brought various charges against Miss Hughes but opposed the granting of her request for a hearing; one trustee says he fought two or three hours against it.

On the day previous to the meeting Mr. Sheldon Parks, a Cleveland lawyer who had gone on the Board to help in a projected campaign for a large additional endowment, had been told of the pending case of Miss Hughes and in reply had promised to go down to the meeting with an open mind and take such action as might seem wise (Letter of Parks to Ludlow, January 31).

Mr. Parks threw himself into the debate and three days later he dictated, through his wife, the following statement:

I was full of righteous indignation. I argued with all the power and earnestness I possess, first, that Miss Hughes had a right to have charges preferred, and to make her defense thereto before the full Board of Trustees, and second, that my rights as a member of the Board of Trustees had been taken from me, because the executive committee had removed this woman from office without any hearing, without charges, and the removal having been actually ordered by the executive committee, it was not to be expected that a majority of the Board would rescind the action of the executive committee, especially when the honor of the President

of the College was at stake.* I was very angry. I made a passionate speech, and at its close I suffered a paralytic stroke. I expected to die Wednesday and Thursday, but today I feel better, at least I feel full of fight.

The Board finally agreed that a committee be appointed to confer with Miss Hughes.

According to President White (June 24) the charges made against Dean Hughes at this (February) meeting of the Board, were the same as those prepared several months later for our committee. According to a member of the executive committee (Schwartz) the only charge, or at least the principal charge, was her management of the X case. According to President White (May 31) this case was used in a wholly incidental way as an illustration of her bad judgment, which seems therefore to have been charged, but which is not one of the charges given to the committee of inquiry. It was brought out afterwards that the President also charged her with telling a student to take a bath; and the committee appointed to confer with Miss Hughes, of which President White was a member, told her the next day that there were no charges—the only thing brought out was “incompatibility of temperament.”

It may be remembered that the President had told the faculty petitioners two days before, that the X case had nothing to do with Dean Hughes' dismissal; but at this meeting he took it up. He began by saying that he would refer to it only for illustrative purposes and that it was not the matter which finally settled the case with him, and then proceeded to describe it in such fashion as to produce a profound effect (Henderson, Higley, White), but left out the essential fact on which Dean Hughes' action was based. When told that his interpretation was not correct, he waved his hands and said “it had no special significance.” (Higley.)

In a letter of June 29, Mr. Aikins wrote President White as follows:

Miss Hughes tells me that when you were in Wooster in the spring of 1915 you told Dean Compton that she was not the religious leader that Mrs. Crawford was and that she had shown unspeakably bad judgment in a case of discipline, namely, the [X case]. This would seem to indicate that at that time religious leadership and Miss Hughes' conduct of that case influenced you more than you now believe. Miss Hughes also says that Dean Compton explained her conduct of that case to

*The reference here is to the letter of dismissal written at Dr. White's instigation. Mr. Parks later issued a platform in opposition to administration policies and was not recommended by the Board to the Synod for re-election in October 1916.

you at that time, so that you had all the facts before you stated the case to the Board. Yet certain members of the Board say that you stated the case in such a way as to leave the impression that Miss Hughes had done something awful. This would be in accordance with your alleged statement to Dean Compton, but not with his alleged statements to you. The matter of the statement to the Board seems to me somewhat important, since, as you say, statements to the Board are privileged, and there is no chance for a member of the faculty to correct them if they are in error or leave an unfortunate impression.

President White replied as follows:

With reference to my interview with Dean Compton in 1915 concerning Miss Hughes, it needs to be remembered that I was seeking his opinion rather than attempting to give him with any fullness my own. It is entirely possible that the main things mentioned in my interview with him were those to which you refer. I do not have any clear recollection of just what was covered in our interview, but I know perfectly well that if those were the main things covered, then it was only a very slight part of the reasons which I had even at that time in my mind for regarding Miss Hughes as incompetent for the position of Dean of Women. If she had been competent in other directions, the things referred to would not have been regarded as anything like sufficient grounds for moving toward her discontinuance. Dean Compton has on one or two occasions expressed to me his interpretation of the incident of Miss Hughes' dealing with the [X case]. His view of the situation has never satisfied me as at all justifying the step that was taken. I was bound under the circumstances to reach my own conclusion about whether it was or was not a case of bad judgment.

It will be observed that President White's reply does not cover the second point—that his statement of fact before the Board was not in accordance with the information given him by Dean Compton. The evidence shows that President White not only failed to tell the Board that Dean Compton's judgment upon the facts was different from his own, but that he gave a misleading conception of the facts themselves in spite of Dean Compton's explanations.

Thus President White used against Miss Hughes an incident which had been settled during the administration of his predecessor to that predecessor's entire satisfaction; he never discussed the case with Miss Hughes herself, but at a meeting of the Board, from which she was necessarily excluded, he misstated the case to her disadvantage in spite of previous explanations from Dean Compton; he failed to state that Dean Compton's judgment differed from his own; he gave his story to the men from whom he said he and others wanted to protect her by the "vague" minute covering her dismissal; he gave his story of this case in defense of Miss Hughes'

dismissal two days after he had told the faculty petitioners that the case had nothing to do with the dismissal.

It may be added that at this meeting of the Board of Trustees, no less than in the conference with the faculty petitioners, President White seems to have left the impression of something very damaging to Miss Hughes which would have to be revealed in case she had a hearing. In reply to a request for a statement on the subject Dr. Higley writes as follows (December 20, 1916):

At the February, 1916, meeting of the Board of Trustees of Wooster College when the case of Miss Hughes was presented, it was urged by several of us that Miss Hughes be permitted to have a hearing before the Board of Trustees. The President objected to this in a very emphatic way and he left the impression upon me that there would be something brought out against Miss Hughes if such a hearing were conducted that would be injurious to her reputation. I felt so strongly about this matter that I spoke to a member of the faculty and asked if he knew anything in Miss Hughes's past of an especially damaging nature. And my recollection is, although of this I am not sure, that I asked Miss Hughes what these implications could mean.

THE "HEARING" BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

In a letter of June 16, President White says: "You will observe that no final action was taken in her case until after she had been given the privilege of two hearings, one by a committee of five members appointed by the Board, and the other an unhurried and complete hearing before the Board as a whole." We must therefore inquire into the nature of this hearing before the committee.

The committee appointed to confer with Dean Hughes consisted of Reverend Robert Watson, of New York City (Chairman), President White, and Drs. Hudnut, Palmer, and Hickock. Mr. Aikins wrote the chairman, inquiring as to the "nature of the charges made against Miss Hughes and the impression as to their justice made upon you and the committee." Dr. Watson replied that the committee "was really a committee of conference. We went to Miss Hughes and informed her that there were no charges against her. The only thing that we had brought out in the Board of Trustees was summed up in the phrase 'incompatibility of temperament.' We informed Miss Hughes that she could bring her case before the full Board of Trustees if she so desired."

Another member of the committee says, "We did not feel, in view of the unanimous action of the executive committee and in

view of Dr. White's strong assertion before the Board of Trustees that he would resign if the Board rescinded this action of its executive committee, that it was expected for us to go into the history of the case. We construed that our function was to harmonize rather than adjudicate." (From a letter transmitted through President White.)

When President White's attention was directed to this statement he wrote (July 3, 1916): "I never said to the Board that I would resign if the action of the executive committee in dismissing Miss Hughes was not confirmed. I did say that I would regard the rescinding of the action as an impeachment of the administration." In either case it is evident that the committee of conference did not attempt to discharge any judicial function, that its hands were tied by President White's own attitude, and that President White's statement that she had a "hearing" before this committee is distinctly misleading, if the word "hearing" is understood in any judicial sense.

What happened at the meeting was this: President White explained that the letter signed by Dr. Hills was meant to be a request for a resignation, and the committee urged her to resign and not stir up new troubles for herself or the College by demanding an investigation in June. (See her letter of February 8, also President White's formal charges.)

"My judgment," says the trustee last quoted, "was that both for the sake of Wooster and for her own sake the best that could be done under the circumstances was that she should withdraw, and I strongly advised her, as I would have advised my own sister, not to initiate a contest. I am sure that was the unanimous opinion of the committee." But Miss Hughes would not yield and she was not conciliatory. She told them that a cook or a janitor would be treated with more consideration than was shown to her by the executive committee; and she scored President White repeatedly. (Two witnesses for this last.)

"When we adjourned," says the trustee from whom we have been quoting, "I felt that we had accomplished nothing and was very sure that Dean Hughes had determined to fight, and that she had brought herself to feel that her interests and those of the University were identical. I believe that she has made a very grave mistake

and that nothing but disaster would now [May 23, 1916] follow upon a reversal of the action already taken."*

On February 3, the day after this meeting with Miss Hughes, President White wrote to Dr. Higley: "Our committee had some hours in consultation with her yesterday and I believe the whole matter is going to be settled in a way that will be satisfactory to all parties concerned, without further controversy." Sometime in May President White wrote for the committee of inquiry: "The committee of five members of the Board of Trustees on February 2, 1916, besought Miss Hughes for her own sake to retire quietly and not attempt to stir up as much trouble as she could in leaving. She clearly indicated at that time that she was seriously considering an appeal to the American Professors' Association for an investigation." (From the formal charges handed to Mr. Aikins on May 31.)

President White's statement to Dr. Higley is somewhat difficult to reconcile with the facts and with his May statement to the committee of inquiry. But both of his statements agree with the evidence of other witnesses to the effect that Miss Hughes' conference with the trustee committee could hardly be called a hearing.

All this evidence as to the real value of the conference seemed so inconsistent with President White's statement of June 16, about the privilege that had been granted to Miss Hughes of a "hearing" before this committee of five trustees, that Mr. Aikins wrote him (June 19) asking if he would tell something about the functions of the committee:

Was it authorized, for example, to reinstate Miss Hughes in case she could refute charges made against her, or was it a mere committee of conference intended, if possible, to get her to accept the inevitable and quietly resign for her own sake or the sake of the College?

Mr. Aikins asked at the same time for a copy of the vote by which the committee was appointed and of its report. The President did not send the documents requested, but replied as follows (June 22):

*Still further proof that this committee considered no charges against Miss Hughes, but simply urged her to recognize incompatibility and retire to save trouble, is found in a letter from her to Dr. Watson dated February 15. It will be found in the Appendix, and gives a good picture of the situation as she saw it.

† See Dr. Watson's letter.

With reference to the committee of five trustees appointed by the Board on February 1 to confer with Miss Hughes, its function and powers were not defined in detail but they certainly had power to come back to the Board and recommend that Miss Hughes be retained if they had thought it wise to do so. As Miss Hughes stated, before the Board meeting in June, that she was not satisfied with meeting this committee and desired to meet the whole Board for a fuller hearing, it was not thought necessary to lay any very great stress on the report of the committee of five trustees. The fact is that Miss Hughes had her hearing before the chairman of that special committee was able to reach the June meeting, so that the whole case was before the Board as a whole, and the report of the committee did not have any very great weight in the final decision. As a matter of fact, however, no one of the five members of this committee thought it would be wise to retain Miss Hughes after the whole case was before them.

In regard to these statements of President White's the following facts must be noted:

1. The "whole case" never "was before them." See their statements already quoted.

2. While the committee may have agreed, and probably did, that it would save trouble if Miss Hughes could be persuaded to withdraw, in the final meeting of the Board about which the President was writing, Dr. Watson, the chairman of this committee, voted *against* the resolution removing Dean Hughes. It is one thing to persuade a person to withdraw and quite another to dismiss him.

3. Whether or not it was technically within the power of the committee to make a judicial investigation and report in Miss Hughes' favor if they found no case against her, it was well understood that they were not expected to do so, as we have already seen.

4. On August 28, Mr. Aikins wrote Dr. Watson: "Will you kindly tell me whether your committee to confer with Miss Hughes made any report beyond the mere recommendation that she have a hearing, and if so what it was?" Dr. Watson replied: "Seeing the Dean asked for a hearing it seemed best to me as chairman simply to request the Board that this be done."

This doubtless explains why President White did not send the requested copy of the committee's report, and why "the report of the committee did not have any very great weight in the final decision." It may be remembered that Dr. White was not only President of the College but also a member of the committee.

On May 18, Miss Hughes wrote Dr. Watson that she wished a hearing before the full Board at its June meeting, and he assured

her that it would be granted. What took place at that second hearing will be considered presently.

THE SECOND FACULTY PETITION

The petition presented to the President by Miss Hughes' colleagues on the evening of January 27 had been signed by twenty-two persons, who actually constituted a large majority of the faculty, but it did not represent any formal action of the faculty. On June 9, 1916, the following resolution was formally introduced.

Moved, that we, as a faculty, hereby express our confidence in Miss Winona A. Hughes as Dean of Women, that we request the Board to retain her as Dean of Women, that we request the Board to restore her her vote in faculty, and that we hereby instruct the secretary of the faculty to transmit this action to the Board of Trustees for consideration and action.

At the February meeting of the Board, the strength of the faculty majority had been seriously diminished by disfranchisements, yet this motion was carried by a vote of twelve to eight, the President voting against it.

On June 24, President White said to Mr. Aikins, apropos of this vote:

It is exasperating that a nominal majority of three or four in the faculty should feel free to go on and force through a vote about retaining Miss Hughes when they knew the attitude of the administration, just because they had a mere majority. That makes cleavages deeper and wider. What is the use of a dozen members of the faculty hitting me in the face that way when I was in the chair? They knew my attitude. I don't think they all intended it as a direct slam at me, though I do think that a little group that has been holding the others together did. I suppose they are a group of men that will always be satisfied when they have their way; not when they don't. The thing had gone entirely too far to be treated that way. It was the administration that was being challenged, not Miss Hughes defended. You must know that there are some who would sing the doxology if I got out of here. I think I am being interpreted in the light of what others have done here and have not yet begun to get justice from some of these men. Certainly I am not inclined to be a dictator. But I don't like to be challenged in the work for which I am principally made responsible before the public. The whole position of college president is undergoing experiment. Certainly I should not be expected to be an expert in my first year. The Board knew my deficiencies. It believed I could learn the administrative details. I think I had a right to expect sympathy and counsel instead of suspicion and criticism and challenge. We are winning out. They all know that well enough. We have the Board and the students and the public, and everything except a few kickers.

To say that the majority in Dean Hughes' favor was merely nominal is misleading. The men were there, but disfranchised. How that came about is another story.

The "kickers" who voted for this resolution included five out of the six ordained Presbyterian ministers on the faculty; Miss Hughes' defenders were distinctly persons of dignity and high moral principle. The committee of inquiry has not heard the subsequent history of the petition contained in the resolution.

THE CIRCULAR LETTER

Two other events intervened between the February and the June meeting of the Board of Trustees. One was the publication and widespread circulation of an anonymous pamphlet setting forth the facts in the Hughes case and the other conditions at Wooster with such intimate knowledge of the situation that it was attributed to members of the faculty. The other was the appointment of the Committee of Inquiry by the American Association of University Professors.

On May 6, this committee wrote to the President of the College and the president of the Board notifying them of its appointment and asking for the causes of Dean Hughes' dismissal. President White replied for both (May 9, 1916) as follows:

The reason for discontinuing these services is, that in the judgment of the administration she is not able to fill the place as we desire to have it filled. If you will give us a little time I think we can give you abundant evidence for this conclusion.

I wish to ask, however, whether this committee is willing to regard as confidential, personal letters concerning the unsuitability of Miss Hughes to fill this position. The only way we can hope to get a frank statement of judgment is by guaranteeing that no public use will be made of the letters. Of course, these will be accompanied by a general statement on the part of the administration which you would be at liberty to publish if you desire. I await your reply before taking any further steps in the matter.

The committee communicated to the President the rules of the Association in regard to confidential letters (May 11), asked for a more definite statement about Miss Hughes' unfitness, and added that it would be grateful for information not only in regard to the causes of Miss Hughes' dismissal but regarding its manner, *e.g.* whether definite charges had been made and by whom, who investigated them, whether Miss Hughes had adequate notice of the charges

or the proposed action of the administration, what evidence was introduced in her defense, and what opportunity was given to her colleagues in the faculty to aid the administration in the formation of its judgment. No reply was made to this communication before May 31, and no direct reply was ever made to the last part of it, regarding the manner of procedure. The ground was covered in other ways. In the meantime President White sent to various individuals the following circular letter, of which, at our request, he sent us a copy on June 10:

WOOSTER, OHIO.

On January 1, 1916, the executive committee of the Board of Trustees informed Miss Hughes that her services as Dean of Women would not be required after the end of this college year.

On February 1, at a full meeting of the Board of Trustees, in response to a request from Miss Hughes for a hearing, a committee of five members of the Board was appointed to confer with her. This committee was in conference with Miss Hughes for some hours on February 2. She was told that she could appear before the Board at its June meeting if she desired to do so. Instead of resigning, or waiting until June to present her case to the Board of Trustees, she has chosen to have appeal made to the "American Association of University Professors," and the executive committee of that Association has voted to authorize an investigation of the matter and has appointed a committee to conduct this investigation.

The College administration is thus forced to the painful necessity of giving the evidence upon which it bases its judgment of the unfitness of Miss Hughes to fill satisfactorily the position she now occupies. Assurance has been received from the chairman of the committee of investigation that letters submitted in evidence will not be given any publicity, but shall be regarded as strictly confidential, if the writers so desire.

Under these circumstances, will you please assist the College by a perfectly frank statement of evidence or conviction that you may have of the unsuitability of Miss Hughes to fill this particular position? And will you very kindly give me the name and address of any other person to whom you think we should apply for further evidence or expression of opinion.

I shall appreciate it deeply if you will regard this whole matter as strictly confidential. We desire to avoid all possible discussion of the question for the sake of peace and harmony in the College community.

Yours very sincerely,

J. CAMPBELL WHITE.

On May 31, Mr. Aikins had his first interview with President White, who handed him some letters against Miss Hughes, said that they had been received in response to a circular letter (the one just given) and explained that while this circular letter was sent to selected persons amongst the students and others, these persons were not selected because of their supposed antagonism to Miss

Hughes, but simply because they were persons whose positions made them representative.

President White also handed Mr. Aikins an undated formal list of "the chief reasons why Miss Hughes is not satisfactory as Dean of Women of the College of Wooster."* The last paragraph of this refers to the letters, as follows:

The College submits as corroborative of the above statements, letters from various members of the faculty, Women's Advisory Board, trustees, alumni, students, parents of students, and others who have been thrown into such close contact with Miss Hughes as to be in a position to form a fair judgment of her fitness to occupy the position of Dean of Women. These letters have all been given with the promise by the College that they are to be regarded as confidential and are to be given no publicity beyond the committee of investigation itself. Professor Aikins, the chairman of the investigating committee, has given me assurance that they will be so treated.

On the next day, President White stipulated that the letters were not to be seen by "local people or by our trustees or by anybody outside of the committee."

At a later date, the President wrote:

I did not receive any letter from anyone in connection with this investigation, who thought that Miss Hughes ought to be retained. Indeed, I have only received one such letter at any time and that was from one of Miss Hughes's most intimate friends, when here as a student. I could get, if necessary, hundreds of additional letters, but it does not seem to me either necessary or wise. We have been trying to handle the whole matter in a way that would make as little disturbance among the students and friends of the College as possible.

On July 3, he writes:

No general appeal was made by me for letters. . . . I did not attempt, though I should have done so, to keep a complete list of the people to whom I wrote for letters, but so far as I know not over two or three at the most failed to reply (and at least one of these explained to me that it had been merely through pressure of other work that she thought that it was too late for a letter to be of any value). The charge by some people that we sent these letters out broadcast is absolutely false.

From all this several things are clear:

1. The President made a demand for formal evidence in the Hughes case, but did not make it until more than four months after Miss Hughes received the letter signed by Dr. Hills, and more than three months after he explained to her and the committee of conference that the letter was meant to be a request for a resignation.

* Printed in full in the appendix.

2. He did not ask those to whom he appealed to confine their evidence to any particular charge or any particular matter that he and the executive committee may have had in mind at the time the letter was written, but left the door wide open for every possible kind of charge, and he did not hand his list of charges to Mr. Aikins until after he had received a considerable number of replies to the circular letter appealing in effect, for "the evidence upon which it [the administration] bases its judgment," etc.

3. He stated in his formal document that the writers were in a position to form a fair judgment, yet he asked the writers themselves only for evidence *against* her.

4. He told Mr. Aikins that the persons addressed were selected because of their representative positions and not because of any supposed antagonism to Miss Hughes, yet he asked his correspondents for the names of others to whom he might write for further evidence, which obviously meant further evidence against her. Moreover he says he got replies from practically everybody addressed, and did not get a single reply favorable to Miss Hughes. Miss Hughes has plenty of friends and this unanimity of adverse criticism is quite unintelligible on the theory that the President sent his confidential request for evidence to any but a carefully edited list of persons.

The committee of inquiry is not in a position to judge of the representative character of many of the President's correspondents, but the letters include ten from faculty people. Three of these, which are very temperate in tone, are from minority heads of College departments, a fourth might be classified as from a department head. The rest are from college subordinates and teachers in the Preparatory School and the Conservatory of Music. The President's list of representative individuals in a position to form a fair judgment does not include ex-President Holden, the Dean of the College, or any other of the twenty-two colleagues who signed the petition in Miss Hughes' favor.

Mr. Aikins was able to see one of the students whose letters President White submitted to the committee. The letter is dated January 28, the only one bearing a date earlier than May 17. She, the writer, explained as already stated that it was written for Dr. White when he thought he might have need of it at the February meeting of the Board. The President had not sent her the recent circular but sometime in May he had called her into his office and

asked if she knew any of the girls who would be willing to make a statement of their feelings regarding Miss Hughes' unfitness for the position. She "put the matter up" to nine or ten girls and six of them said they would. She approached only her own friends and not those who were friendly to Miss Hughes. Out of the nine girls whom this student named as having been approached by her only one and the father of one other actually wrote the desired letters. None of the six who had promised wrote. In explanation of this, President White says (July 3) he did not know that his emissary approached nearly so many people. She came two or three days after her talk with him to say that in spite of profound conviction those to whom she had spoken preferred not to write; and he let it be known that there was no desire to put the slightest pressure on anyone. All this may be so, but it throws further light upon the question of how the President's representative people were selected and upon the unanimity of their response.

5. President White intimated to his correspondents that their replies were for the sole use of the committee of inquiry, wrote to the committee that the letters had been given under a promise to that effect, and stipulated to Mr. Aikins that they should not be seen by local people or by anybody outside of the committee. A scrupulous observance of the spirit of these limitations made it practically impossible for the committee to investigate the animus of the writers or to get Miss Hughes' version of the various stories which they told, for, of course, Miss Hughes was one of the local people to whom the letters were not to be shown.

6. He stated specifically that the letters should not be shown to any trustee. But yet, as we shall see, many of them were read by the President himself at the meeting of the full Board of Trustees in June. The various prohibitions which he had previously imposed made it impossible for any trustee to examine them beforehand, on Miss Hughes' behalf, and at the meeting Miss Hughes herself was not allowed to hear them.

The charges which the President made against Miss Hughes on May 31 to the committee of inquiry, and which these letters are intended to support, may be roughly summarized as "nervousness," lack of "poise and force," inability "to get the best out of young women" or to arouse their enthusiasm for her own personality, together with the disapproval of alumnae and "the most influential women in College." There is nothing in the charges or in the letters

given in support of them to justify the dark intimations which frightened some of the faculty petitioners on the evening of January 28.

SUGGESTED CHANGE OF VENUE

On May 31, Mr. Aikins carried out instructions by suggesting very tentatively to President White that he might care to avail himself of the suggestion that the case be submitted to a committee of the faculty elected by themselves. Everybody knew how the faculty stood; and the President naturally refused.

After spending some five days in Wooster, Mr. Aikins became convinced that Miss Hughes could not expect a fair trial before the Board of Trustees, a third of whom were on the executive committee which had condemned her without a hearing and who were publicly committed to their action. On June 6 he therefore made another suggestion, namely, that before taking final action on the case the Board should submit it to the committee which the Synod of Ohio had appointed in the autumn of 1915 to consider possible changes in the charter and by-laws of the College, and which was still standing. The President promised to pass on the suggestion to the Board but did "not see how the Board could escape its own responsibility in this way." No further communication passed on the subject.

THE HEARING BEFORE THE BOARD

On June 13, Miss Hughes had her hearing before the full Board of Trustees. A few things worth noting took place at this meeting.

1. It was ruled that the executive committee's letter of January 1 constituted a dismissal by the executive committee (whose minutes, however, had still to be confirmed by the Board).

2. President White opposed a reference of the case either to the Synod's committee appointed to revise the charter and by-laws of the College, or to the joint committee of trustees and faculty already contemplated and afterwards approved for the hearing of such cases. He stated that Miss Hughes had asked for a hearing before the Board and she should have one.

3. Miss Hughes was called in, heard the President read the charges he had prepared for the committee of inquiry, stated her case and answered questions.

4. Miss Hughes was not allowed to explain her conduct of the X case. President White objected to its being dragged in; Dr. Higley insisted that it was the President himself who had introduced it in the February meeting, and that the Board had stated that Miss Hughes would be allowed to answer all charges; and then a resolution was passed about it. President White states the matter in this way:

I wonder if it has been called to your attention that the Board, by formal vote, declared that the [X case] should have no weight with the Board in its final decision. As a matter of fact this incident was so incidental, that it was not even mentioned in the meeting of the executive committee where it was decided to discontinue Miss Hughes' services. The chairman of the committee, Dr. Hills, who presided at that meeting, did not even know about that incident until recently. (Letter of June 22, 1916.)

What took place at the meeting of the executive committee we know already. What took place at the meeting of the Board was this. It was moved and carried without dissent, Drs. Weir and Heron being present, that this incident [the X case] had not had any influence in bringing about the dismissal of Dean Hughes by the executive committee, and should have no weight with the Board.* Some time afterwards Miss Hughes said she thought that the first part of the resolution—to which President White made no reference in the letter just quoted—was not true, and Dr. White thereupon actually read in the meeting letters from both these men laying stress upon the incident. Either before or after the reading of these letters, Dr. Heron arose and said that when the vote was taken he had kept quiet and did not vote one way or the other.

5. One concrete charge seems to have been proved against Miss Hughes. So far as the committee of inquiry knows it is the only one.

Under date of June 16, President White writes as follows:

At the hearing which Miss Hughes had before the Board, she was asked whether she had not in the presence of two other women of the community [they were college house-matrons] stated that I was the biggest hypocrite and liar in the United States. Her whole bearing and manner of answering the question persuaded most of the members of the Board that she had made this statement.† She admitted saying something like it, but could not recall the exact words.

* This is not from any official record. On June 27, Mr. Aikins wrote asking President White to send him a copy of this resolution, but the request seems to have been overlooked.

In reply to the question whether the charge of commenting unfavorably upon his veracity and sincerity had been sprung upon Miss Hughes in such a way as to surprise and confuse her or whether she had been given reasonable notice so that she might prepare any defense that seemed to her appropriate, President White wrote (June 22, 1916):

It was not put in the form of a charge, but one of the members of the Board stated to Miss Hughes that this incident had been reported to him and asked her if it was true. I presume the main purpose was to reveal whether or not Miss Hughes's personal attitude towards the President made it a wise thing for her to be continued in the position of Dean.

Dr. Wishard, who asked the question, writes as follows:

The only part Dr. White had in the matter was in giving his consent to my asking the question. As such a charge involved his good name I did not feel at liberty to raise the question without first telling him about it, which I did just before the meeting that morning. After Miss Hughes' statement [*i. e.* her accounts of her work, etc.] he withdrew his objection to my putting the question.

6. After Miss Hughes had left the room President White read a large number of the letters against her which he had told the writers were for the sole use of the committee of inquiry and which he had forbidden the committee to show to any local person or any trustee, so that neither Miss Hughes nor anybody on her behalf had had a chance to examine them. When it was demanded that Miss Hughes be brought back to hear this evidence against her, the chairman (Dr. Hills) and President White refused, and the reading went on in her absence. It may be said however that the force of the letters was somewhat broken by the monotony of their condemnatory phrases, so that President White interrupted the reading to explain that there had been no collusion.*

*On June 29, Mr. Aikins directed Dr. White's attention to Miss Hughes' statement that at this meeting he "had read the letters against her collected for our committee, and that an effort to allow her to hear them was defeated. . . . You will remember that you pledged me not to show them to any trustee." He replied that the letters were merely corroborative of the general statement [the charges] which was read to Miss Hughes in the presence of the Board; that he wished to avoid creating unnecessary bitterness on Miss Hughes' part towards the writers; that he wished to read the letters without the names of the writers, but the Board objected; that he only read a part of the letters; that he wished to stir up as little bad blood as possible; "that Dr. Higley, who was acting as Miss Hughes' attorney had a mass of correspondence in favor of Miss Hughes, which it was quite well understood was to be read after Miss Hughes retired. We were

7. During the session President White repeated his February statement that a vote for Miss Hughes would be a vote against the administration.

8. The following resolution was finally passed:

Owing to a great deal of adverse criticism of the executive committee in advising Miss Winona Hughes that her services terminate at the end of the school year—an action subject to review by the Board at its June meeting—and inasmuch as Miss Hughes requested a hearing which was fully granted and both Miss Hughes and the executive committee having been fully heard, the Board took the following action; First, that the executive committee in dismissing Miss Hughes simply followed an unbroken line of precedents, the action of the executive committee becoming the action of the Board, and hence this committee acted in absolute good faith, and that this Board having this fact in mind after hearing both sides sustains the action of the executive committee. Second, that the Board also takes this further action that the method of dismissing teachers heretofore followed by the Board is wrong in principle, that in future teachers shall have an opportunity in advance to be heard.

This resolution confirming and condemning the action of the executive committee was carried by a vote of fourteen to four.*

Nine of the fourteen who voted for it were members of the executive committee. One of the remaining five afterwards took the trouble to write Miss Hughes a letter explaining that his vote was not on the merits of her case—which had really never been settled—but was to his mind necessitated by the obligation to support the

quite prepared to allow these to be read in Miss Hughes' absence. There was no more reason why she should hear letters on one side of the case than on the other, but the main point is that they were merely corroborative of charges that were made against Miss Hughes when she was having her hearing before the whole Board."

One corroborates evidence, not charges, and apart from these letters there seems to have been little or no evidence. To all intents and purposes the letters were the whole case. Miss Hughes had been promised a "hearing" and it had been distinctly stated that she should be allowed to answer all charges made against her before the Board. However much evidence there may have been to present in her favor, it is difficult to see how she could answer charges so long as she was given no chance to hear the evidence on which they were based. How, for example, could she answer the charge that she lacked "poise and force" if she did not know when she was supposed to have shown such a lack?

* President White says "Two other trustees who were present during the discussion but had to withdraw before the vote asked that their votes be recorded in favor of sustaining the action of the executive committee." We do not know whether that means that they were in favor of this particular resolution or not.

new administration and by the situation that had been created by the regrettable action of the executive committee and of the President, who had ruined for her all prospect of future usefulness and influence at Wooster. (See Appendix.)

After Miss Hughes' case had been disposed of the "Pennsylvania Rule" was passed in the following terms:

A Professor or an Assistant Professor shall be removed by the Board of Trustees only after a conference between a committee consisting of five representatives of the faculty of the College and elected by said faculty, and a committee of equal number from the Board of Trustees and the President, at which conference the President shall preside, and upon a report from such conference to the Board of Trustees for consideration and action by them.

Moreover a committee consisting of President White and Dr. Watson was appointed to take up the question of promotions, which, as we shall see, had become very acute.

The subsequent history of the Pennsylvania Rule and of the question of promotions, demotions, and dismissals will be found in the next section of the report.

In the minds of persons familiar with the Wooster situation there is little doubt that by refusing to resign and forcing a fight on the question of her dismissal Miss Hughes secured the safety of her colleagues, or rather of those of them who come under the protection of the rule,—at least for the present.

SUMMARY OF THE HUGHES CASE

The College of Wooster is under the ultimate control of the Presbyterian Synod of Ohio, but it has a Board of (thirty) Trustees, who do most of their business through an executive committee, consisting of the nine or ten members of the Board who reside in the city of Wooster. This executive committee includes the president of the Board as well as the president of the College and has unusual powers. In the course of nearly twenty years the principal of the Preparatory Department of the College (who has a seat and a vote in the College faculty) has developed a Summer School with an attendance three times as large as that of the College itself, intended largely for elementary and rural teachers. Until very recently this school was a purely private enterprise, though it had the use of the College buildings. Its methods have been such as to arouse the fears and the antagonism of most of the College faculty.

A new state law regarding the certification of teachers threatened greatly to reduce the attendance at this Summer School unless it was taken over by the College and made the summer session of a regular two-year elementary normal school course. A proposal to this effect was strongly advocated by local interests because of the financial benefit accruing to them through the Summer School students, and in February, 1915, it was adopted by the Board, with the aid of local trustee votes, against the advice of President Holden and a large majority of the faculty. President Holden thereupon resigned. Within a week a movement was started to elect Dr. J. Campbell White, the mover of this vote, to the presidency. At a special meeting of the Board in May, 1915, the normal school vote was recognized to have been illegal and was repealed. But Dr. White was put on a committee to nominate a new president, and at the end of a single month this committee recommended Dr. White for the place in such a way as to make it appear that the faculty approved of the recommendation, though his name had never been mentioned to them. Dr. White was present when his nomination was made in this way to the Board, and being still present he was elected. Shortly afterwards he had the faculty called together and, with his wife, went to ask them whether he should accept. In a succession of private conferences he was advised to decline, but a month later he accepted because, as he said in a published article, "character is caught, not taught," and he wished, like Christ, to communicate it to a few leaders by constant contact, and for other somewhat similar reasons (see p. 27). Dr. White says that as soon as he decided to accept the position he began to ask alumni what changes should be made in the staff.

Though the normal school vote was repealed, the Summer School was taken under the control of the College, and ever since February, 1915, it has been a source of constant friction. In order to have its work recognized in any way whatever (even indirectly) by the state authorities (which is necessary if numbers are to be kept up), it is necessary or desirable that the Summer School should be under the management of the College. But under the charter of the College this would mean management by the College faculty, and if it were put into the hands of the faculty there is danger that it would use methods and enforce standards likely to interfere with a large attendance. The present administration of

the College has therefore resorted to various expedients by which the College might retain a technical control of the Summer School through a limited faculty management or an appearance of faculty management, without interfering to any great extent with the control actually exercised by Professor Dickason, the principal of the Preparatory Department.

The majority of the faculty are opposed to this policy and their opposition has lead to open ruptures with the President. In the fall or early winter of 1915 there was much talk (in which the Principal of the Preparatory Department participated) of approaching dismissals in the faculty. On January 1, 1916, the executive committee sent Miss Winona Hughes, Dean of Women, a letter in which she was told that her services would not be required after the end of that academic year.

Miss Hughes, a graduate of Wooster, was teaching successfully at Mount Holyoke College when she was called to Wooster. After a year of other work she was elected Dean of Women, and was serving her fourth year in that capacity when she was given this notice of dismissal. Miss Hughes was on a permanent appointment, her work had been highly satisfactory to President Holden, and she had never had any intimation from any member of the executive committee or from the new President that there was any respect in which it was not satisfactory. None of them had ever talked over her work with her. The reason given her for her dismissal was that the College contemplated certain economies, which, as a matter of fact, it has not made. Her colleagues believed the real reason was that she was a member of the faculty majority (opposing the normal school policy), that her religion was not of the emotional type, and that she was unpopular with some of the student leaders.

The letter of dismissal was drafted by President White, who explained a few days later (January 10) to a member of the Board that the real reason for Dean Hughes' dismissal was not that given in the letter, but her unfitness for the place. Shortly after that a member of the executive committee of the Board explained to the Dean of the College (Dr. Compton) that the main reasons for the dismissal were the adverse opinion of the Women's Advisory Board and its president and Dean Hughes' unfortunate management of a certain difficult situation which we have called the X case. Dean Compton knew the facts in the X case and explained

that Dean Hughes' management of it had been very much to her credit, and he soon found that the Women's Advisory Board had never discussed Dean Hughes' administration and that the president of that board supported her warmly.

On January 28, 1916, Dean Compton and six other full professors presented President White with a petition signed by a large majority of the College faculty asking that he use his influence with the Board to secure a reconsideration of Dean Hughes' case and setting forth her achievements as Dean of Women—amongst them a notable improvement in the conduct and manners of the girls in the College dormitories. President White objected to this petition going to the Board, denounced the petitioners, declared that the X case and the supposed opinion of the Women's Advisory Board and its president had had nothing to do with Dean Hughes' dismissal, gave the impression that he was in possession of information very damaging to her which would come out if the petition was pressed, but refused to say what it was or even in confidence to tell the Dean of the College, and said that he was withholding this information in order to protect Dean Hughes' reputation. Thus he finally succeeded in compelling the petitioners to withdraw the petition, and then a few days later told the Board of Trustees that the faculty had been won around to his attitude. Later President White and various members of the executive committee all stated in the most positive terms to Mr. Aikins that they knew absolutely nothing against the character of Dean Hughes. The committee of inquiry never received the slightest scrap of evidence that anybody ever suspected such a thing except as a result of what President White said.

A few days before this conference, President White had asked a girl student, who lived in the dormitory with Dean Hughes, to gather evidence against her which he might use at the approaching meeting of the full Board. At the Board meeting (February 1, 1916) President White opposed granting a petition from Dean Hughes for a hearing, gave a misleading and damaging account of her action in the X case (which, by the way, had been revived from the administration of President Holden, who was perfectly satisfied with the action of Dean Hughes), conveyed the impression that an investigation would uncover something very damaging in Miss Hughes' past, and said that he would regard the rescinding of the action of the executive committee as an impeachment of the

administration. He finally consented to the appointment of a committee of conference, of which he was a member, to talk things over with Dean Hughes.

This committee "construed that its functions were to harmonize rather than adjudicate." It informed her that there were no charges against her, and made no attempt to enter into the merits of the case. It told her that if she wanted a hearing before the full Board in June she could have it, but urged her to be "one of the long line of Christian martyrs" and save trouble for herself and the College by not insisting upon a hearing. At this conference, as at the conference with her colleagues a few days earlier, President White urged silence on the ground that publicity at that time would lead to the defeat of an application for a Phi Beta Kappa charter. Miss Hughes maintained that she had a duty to the College and to her profession which might compel publicity, and took no pains to conceal her opinion of the treatment which had been given her by President White. One of the committee says that when they adjourned he felt that they had accomplished nothing, and according to a later statement by President White, Miss Hughes at this time "clearly intimated that she was considering an appeal to the American Association of University Professors." But the day after the conference Dr. White wrote Dr. Higley, a member of the Board, that they had had a conference and he believed that the whole matter was going to be settled in a way satisfactory to all parties concerned without further controversy, and he afterwards made to the committee of inquiry a number of other statements concerning this committee's functions, which do not appear to give a fair representation of the facts in the case.

On June 9, 1916, the faculty of the College passed a formal vote expressing its confidence in Dean Hughes and requesting the Board of Trustees to retain her and restore her vote in the faculty (which had been taken from her—and others—in February). President White voted against this resolution, which he regarded as "hitting him in the face" and a challenge to the administration, and he afterwards said: "We have the Board and the students and the public, and everything except a few kickers." The "kickers" include five out of the six Presbyterian ministers on the faculty, and practically all of those from whom the College can reasonably hope for anything in the way of scholarly achievement.

On May 6, the committee of inquiry appointed by the American Association of University Professors wrote to President White inquiring why Dean Hughes had been dismissed. In reply he asked the committee if it would "regard as confidential personal letters concerning the unsuitability of Miss Hughes to fill this position," and, having received satisfactory assurances, he sent out dozens of "strictly confidential" circular letters asking in effect for "the evidence upon which it [the administration] bases its judgment of the unfitness of Miss Hughes to fill satisfactorily the position she now occupies" (see page 67) and for the names and addresses of others to whom he could "apply for further evidence or expression of opinion." On May 31 President White stated that these letters were not sent to persons selected because of their supposed antagonism to Miss Hughes, but other evidence goes to show that they were. On May 31, having received a considerable number of replies to this circular, President White handed them to Mr. Aikins together with an undated document setting forth the "Chief Reasons why Miss Hughes is not satisfactory as Dean of Women of the College of Wooster." He wrote that the letters against Miss Hughes had "all been given with the promise by the College that they are to be regarded as confidential and are to be given no publicity beyond the committee of investigation itself," and he specified verbally that the letters were not to be seen by "local people or by our trustees or by anybody outside of the committee." But President White himself read many of these letters to the full Board of Trustees on June 13, two weeks after his stipulation that no trustee should see them.

At the time that President White was writing for letters against Dean Hughes, a student emissary of his (who lived in the dormitory with Miss Hughes) was secretly approaching her fellow students and asking for similar statements "of their feelings regarding her unfitness for the position." She "put it up to" nine girls, all of them her own friends and none of them friends of Miss Hughes, and six of the nine promised to write, though apparently only one of the nine did so.

On June 6, the chairman of the committee of inquiry wrote President White saying that during a stay of four days in Wooster he had become convinced that Dean Hughes was entitled to a change of venue, and suggesting that before taking final action the Board should submit the case to a committee of the Presbyterian

Synod of Ohio which had been already appointed to consider possible changes in the charter and by-laws of the College. The suggestion was not accepted.

At the meeting of the full Board of Trustees on June 13, after President White had opposed a reference of the case to either of two suggested tribunals, Miss Hughes had her hearing, and when it was announced that she was there prepared to hear charges against her, President White read those which he had prepared for the committee of inquiry five months after her dismissal by the executive committee. When she wished to explain her conduct of the X case (charged against her in the February meeting) President White objected, and a vote was finally passed to the effect that that case had had nothing to do with the action of the executive committee and should have nothing to do with that of the Board. Miss Hughes pointed out, and it was proved, to the embarrassment of at least one trustee who had let the vote pass without comment, that the historical part of this motion was not true to fact, and President White afterwards gave Mr. Aikins an imperfect and entirely misleading account of this vote.

After Miss Hughes left the room, President White read many of the secret letters against her and refused to have her called back to hear and answer this evidence. Sometime during the session, President White repeated his February statement that a vote for Miss Hughes would be a vote against the administration, and it was finally voted (14 to 4) that the executive committee had followed precedent and acted in absolute good faith in dismissing Dean Hughes, and that its action should therefore be sustained, though it was wrong in principle, and that in future teachers should have an opportunity in advance to be heard. Nine of the fourteen who voted for this resolution confirming and condemning the action of the executive committee were themselves members of that committee. One of the remaining five wrote Miss Hughes afterwards that his vote had not been on the merits of the case but necessitated by the situation which President White and the executive committee had created.

At a later period in the meeting, the trustees passed the "Pennsylvania rule" concerning the dismissal of professors and assistant professors. In communicating the results of this meeting to the committee of inquiry (June 16), President White states that, at her hearing before the Board, Dean Hughes had been asked whether

she had not stated in the presence of two other women that he was the biggest hypocrite and liar in the United States and that she admitted saying something like it, though she was not sure of the words. So far as we know, this was the only concrete charge made against her at this meeting. In the same letter, President White also says, "You will observe that no final action was taken in her case until she had been given the privilege of two hearings"—one by the committee of conference in February, and one by the full Board in June,—yet no attempt had been made on either occasion to settle the matter on its merits.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE CASE OF DEAN HUGHES.

In framing this section of the report the committee of inquiry has tried to preserve a distinction between the question whether Miss Hughes was a satisfactory person for the position of Dean of Women at the College of Wooster and the question of the means taken by the College authorities to ascertain the facts in the case, to discover a wise and just solution for whatever problem the facts, as ascertained, might be found to present, and to carry out their policies. It is this latter question which the committee has attempted to answer.

The question whether Miss Hughes was or was not a satisfactory person for the position of Dean of Women at the College of Wooster is one which the committee of inquiry has not attempted to answer from any standpoint of its own. What one finds satisfactory depends upon what one wants, and the committee of inquiry does not feel called upon to fix the standards by which the College of Wooster should judge its Dean of Women or any other of its executive officers. It is evident that Dean Hughes was satisfactory to President Holden and Dean Compton and had the support of the majority of her colleagues, and that she was not satisfactory to President White, to the more active local trustees, and to the faculty supporters of the Dickason policies. It is also evident that President Holden and Dean Compton knew her and her problems as the local trustees and President White did not, and that, unlike the latter, President Holden and Dean Compton had had a long academic experience and shared the ordinary academic conceptions of what a college should be.

PART III. THE SUMMER SCHOOL, THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE FACULTY MAJORITY

SUMMARY OF PART III

When the Board of Trustees of the College of Wooster undertook to "save the Summer School" by making the College responsible for its work and inaugurating the two-year normal course, it found itself confronting an awkward dilemma. To get state recognition the Summer School as well as the normal course had to be managed by the College, and certificates of attendance and scholarship issued by College authorities, not merely by individual instructors. But under the law of the State of Ohio management by the College meant management by the College faculty,* and local trustees did not want the Summer School managed by the faculty; for they feared that if the faculty did not kill the Summer School they would at least revolutionize its methods and introduce regulations that would interfere very seriously with the large attendance.

The history of the College for the next year or more can be understood most easily if it is conceived of as consisting of a series of unsuccessful attempts on the part of the administration to avoid this dilemma. How to give the faculty enough control, or enough appearance of control, of the Summer School to satisfy the requirements of the law without giving it the genuine control that might result in cutting down the large attendance of rural and elementary teachers—that, we believe, was the problem that the administration tried to solve.

In its attempts to solve this problem the administration found itself in constant conflict with the faculty majority, and after the dismissal of Dean Hughes the Summer School question was more or less overshadowed by the questions of academic freedom and academic tenure which this conflict and her dismissal involved. The "Pennsylvania rule" regarding dismissals seems to have been agreed upon in February, 1916, and was adopted in June; but no machinery was created to carry it out, and the strife, which still continues, now centers about the interpretation of this rule and about certain recommendations made by the Synod of Ohio in October, 1916, for its extension. The first expedient by which it was hoped to gain the kind of Summer School management that local interests required was the creation of a joint committee of trustees and fac-

* See Brief by Judge John E. West, *Wooster Quarterly*, July, 1915.

ulty members, with the friends of the ideals of the majority of the faculty in a minority. This joint committee lived for a while and was then declared illegal.

Then came the election of a new President of local origin, with local family connections and already committed to the normal school policy. After that came, in the fall, a reconstruction of the faculty committee which deals with questions of educational policy. This threw its control into the hands of men known to be favorable to Professor Dickason's policies; but the faculty majority protested and the committee was again changed.

At about the same time came a meeting of the Synod of Ohio, and, apparently, for fear that it might do something to interfere with the Summer School and normal school policies, the executive committee in the name of the Board earnestly recommended that it take no action, and made statements about "standards of thoroughness" and faculty control in the Summer School, and the "atmosphere of mutual love and consideration," which convey an erroneous impression of the actual state of affairs.

After this, when the Board of Trustees put the control of college work in the Summer School definitely into the hands of a committee elected by the College faculty, the new President and the executive committee found an excuse for putting this College committee itself under the control of a "Summer School Senate," favorable to Professor Dickason's plans, and thus for a time nullified the work of the Board.

The next phase of the conflict is one of intimidation. There were rumors (which President White did not stop) of dismissal for majority faculty members, statements by Professor Dickason about long vacations for certain of his opponents, threats by President White himself, and a state of "panic" which he would not end by giving the faculty the assurances of safety which the Board had made it clear that it wished him to give.

Next, the voting section of the faculty was reorganized in anticipation of the new "Pennsylvania rule" regarding dismissals; and this was managed in such a way as to leave minority men of slender academic attainments with votes and the prospect of protection, while better qualified men of the majority were disfranchised and left without the protection of the anticipated rule.

This happened in February, 1916. Between that time and the end of 1916 five members of the majority, all of whom had had

votes before February 2, 1916, left the institution. The Dean of Women was finally dismissed, the Registrar broke down and resigned, and the Assistant Professor of English, the disfranchised man who had been supposed to be Professor of Physical Education, and the disfranchised Instructor in Chemistry all resigned. Fortunately for the majority, at least two of the President's new appointees voted with them in the fall of 1916.

Since the Synod of Ohio has ultimate jurisdiction over the College of Wooster and its property, it is important that it should be correctly informed about the affairs of the College and that its recommendations to the Board of Trustees should be carried into effect. It appears to the committee of inquiry that the report to the Synod of Ohio made on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the College of Wooster by its executive committee in October, 1916, does not give a fair representation of certain matters which are of vital interest to the College and its faculty. It also appears to the committee of inquiry that since the meeting of the Synod of Ohio in October, 1916, the administration of the College has attempted to evade the establishment of certain regulations for the protection of the College and its faculty which the Synod at that time recommended.

The events here briefly summarized are treated in detail in the following pages.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONTROL

The resolution which established the two-year normal course on February 2, 1915, placed both it and the Summer School under a committee of control appointed by the Board, which should be "responsible for its work" and "have charge of the selection of teachers, both of the Summer School and of the normal course." The committee which the Board named consisted of three professors (Dean Compton and Professor Vance, of the majority, and Professor Notestein of the minority) and three local trustees (Drs. Heron, Weir, and Wishard). The faculty majority had protested against the normal school vote (see Appendix p. 143); but nevertheless the joint committee met on the morning of Saturday, February 6, elected Dean Compton chairman, and took various steps calculated to carry out the will of the Trustees. One of these was to divide the normal and summer work into a college section (Professor Kelso, Dean) and a normal section (Professor Dickason, Principal).

and to order that the head of each section present to the committee a list of teachers for the approaching session of the Summer School, with a statement of their qualifications.

On the following Monday, however, Professor Dickason (Principal of the Preparatory Department and late proprietor of the Summer School) appeared before the committee with a list of twenty-four teachers with whom he had already made contracts for teaching *college* courses during the following summer, but he presented no statement of their qualifications. Professor Notestein and the local trustees took the view that as this list had been approved by the Trustees in the previous October (before the Summer School had been taken over for real control by the College) the committee also must approve it. The situation was complicated by the fact that some of the names had already been printed at the press owned by Professors Notestein and Dickason. With the aid of trustee votes Professor Notestein's view prevailed, and the constructive action of the day before was first nullified and then formally reconsidered. Feeling that the functions of the joint committee had been reduced to little more than the formal approval of Professor Dickason's arrangements, Dean Compton resigned his position on it. His letter of resignation, which will be found in the Appendix, gives a full account of the procedure of the committee.

At the special meeting of the Board in May this joint committee was declared to be illegal because it took the control of instruction out of the hands of the faculty, and it was abolished, along with the two-year normal course, which was found not to have been properly established, because the resolution establishing it involved a virtual change in the by-laws of the Board and had been carried by less than the majority of two-thirds required in such cases.

It will be observed that the vote establishing the normal course was rescinded, but—on the surface at least—for purely technical reasons. This made it possible for both the advocates and the opponents of the normal school policy to say they represented the desires of the Board. We are informed that at the meeting of the Board in June, 1916, there was a general agreement that the normal school policy was definitely abandoned; but unfortunately there was no vote to that effect, and so the question is still open and still a source of grave uneasiness.

It may be added that when the two-year normal course was abolished it was found possible to "save the Summer School" at

least for the present, in another way, namely, by getting the state normal schools to accept work done at Wooster as a partial fulfillment of their own requirements. It was still necessary or desirable, however, that the Summer School should be recognized as a part of the College. This left two questions of policy to divide the faculty majority and the local trustees: the possible re-establishment of the two-year normal course, in the interest of the Summer School, and the management of the Summer School itself.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL PLAN OF THE FACULTY

In May, 1915, "the faculty received from the Secretary of the Board of Trustees the request that the faculty, at its earliest convenience present to the Board 'a plan for carrying on the work of the Summer School.' After careful study the faculty, on June 10, adopted the plan outlined below for recommendation to the Board, and the plan was placed in the hands of the Board. It was not until about October 7 that the faculty learned that the Board had not intended to make the request, and that the plan submitted by the faculty had not been read to the Board."

This plan, which was strongly advocated by a large majority of the faculty, provided that the Summer School should be called "The Summer Session of the College of Wooster" and that it should offer courses (1) for students of college grade wishing to do vacation work, (2) for high school teachers and others of college grade wishing to do work in education and other college departments for its own sake or for the sake of meeting state requirements for high school teachers, (3) for students who wish to take high school branches such as are required for entrance to the College of Wooster.

The "plan" for the giving of these courses was worked out in detail. At the same time various arguments were used against including elementary normal work.

Some time after October 7, 1915, this "plan" was printed. It is a strong document, dignified, reasonable, and well wrought out. The plan's adoption would doubtless have involved a temporary and perhaps a permanent cutting down of Summer School numbers, but would not have meant the death of the school. The trouble that the faculty majority took to work out this plan, and their support of it, offer a conclusive answer to the statement frequently made that the faculty majority desire "the death of the Summer School."

In June, 1915, the faculty by formal vote submitted to the Trustees "A Proposal as to the Future Educational Policy of the College of Wooster," made "in the interests of harmony and unity of effort." This document can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. We suggest that Wooster, abandoning distinctly professional work, all plans for technical work and graduate work, should move forward to her rightful place as a college of liberal arts of the highest rank. It is our hope that Wooster's aim should be intensive rather than extensive. In a very real sense Wooster should be made the great college of the Presbyterian Church, gaining that leadership in things intellectual which it already possesses in things moral and spiritual.

2. To this end the College Department of the Summer School should be under the immediate control of the College faculty. Only thus can true college standards be maintained and the reputation of the College be properly safeguarded.

4-9. There should be a gradual reconstruction of the educational work and a gradual reorganization of the faculty, so that Wooster may approximate the standards of Princeton or Bryn Mawr, or the theoretical work in science of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and not merely compete with local Ohio institutions. New chairs should be established, new men brought in at higher salaries, and new endowment raised to make this possible. In the long run, this will bring better students and more of them and enhance "our reputation and influence for good."

The committee of inquiry does not know the fate of this communication. Its recommendations were not carried out.

STATEMENTS OF THE PRESIDENT

It will be remembered that shortly after his election to the presidency in June, 1915, Dr. White had the faculty called together to discuss with them the question of accepting the office. A majority account of this meeting says:

During his consultation with one group of the faculty (some seven or eight men) Mr. White had this question put to him: "Which faction of the faculty do you intend shall rule?" His answer to this was: "I intend that the will of the majority of the faculty shall rule, of course."

Another question asked him was: "How do you stand on the normal school question?" His emphatic answer was: "The normal school is a dead issue so far as I am concerned." Mr. White also stated emphatically at this group meeting that he expected to do nothing to perpetuate the fight against the will of the majority of the faculty.

Just a few days before the February (1916) meeting of the Board of Trustees the President stated, in the presence of several members of the faculty that when he said that the normal school was a "dead issue" with him, he did not realize the significance of the statement. [According to another account he said that he had meant it was dead in the form in which it had been discussed.]

On June 1, 1916, President White was asked by the committee of inquiry if the two-year normal course was quite dead. He replied "Well, it's not under discussion. There are men on the faculty who are still in favor of it, but they are not making any agitation about it." When asked if a public statement to this effect might not allay misgivings on the part of the majority of the faculty, he replied, "No more public statement is needed than has been made to the faculty itself. I'd want the whole Board to act in any case of that sort certainly."

When asked about the promise that the majority should rule, President White said (June 24, 1916):

I think the reference was to the normal school and I said to them I was not in favor of mere majority rule—I wanted practical unanimity before the question was settled,—and that certainly no educational policy would be pressed against the judgment of the faculty. But I am not satisfied with mere majority rule. I propose to wait till there is practical unanimity.

FACULTY COMMITTEES

At the very beginning of Dr. White's first year as president, an exceedingly unpleasant situation arose in regard to the appointment of faculty committees. It appears that since the beginning of President Holden's administration it had been customary for the president to appoint the faculty committees, but that it was not customary to make any radical change in them from year to year. Professor Notestein, for example, had been chairman of the library committee for many years.

In the fall of 1915, Dr. White appointed a consulting committee to help him appoint the standing committees for the year. This consulting committee was appointed by him of his own volition in full faculty meeting, and in a subsequent conference the President and the consulting committee made up a list of standing committees with their personnel, to which all agreed. It appears from the testimony of Professor Bennett, a minority member of the faculty,* that after this was done President White conferred with at least two members of the minority, himself and Professor Notestein. But he had no further conference with the consulting committee. Later, when President White was away from Wooster, announcement was made of the committees which he had appointed.

*Mr. Aikins regrets to say that he neglected to submit his notes of the interview to Professor Bennett for revision.

They had been changed very radically, or, as a majority writer put it, "revolutionized." "This," the writer went on to say, "though disconcerting, would have been accepted but for the fact that the committee on curriculum, which is not a committee for administrative details but for study and initial shaping of policies affecting the curriculum, had been so changed as to throw the majority of this most important committee into the hands of the small minority of the faculty on the normal school issue. [Principal Dickason, who does no teaching in the College proper, was on this committee.] It was believed by the large majority of the faculty that this was an unfair arrangement, and would, if allowed to stand, almost inevitably result in trying and wasteful controversies over important policies, and hence a reconsideration of the committees was asked for and obtained (on Magna Charta principles). There was no purpose to embarrass the President but rather to prevent embarrassment."

In the arrangement made by the President, it appears that four members of the majority were dropped from the curriculum committee (Martin, Mateer, Archibald, Vance) and two members of the minority (Dickason, Remp) added.*

As already stated, President White was not in Wooster when the committees, as he had reconstructed them, were announced, and at the instance of the majority of his colleagues, Professor Gould, secretary of the faculty, sent him a telegram about the matter signed "Gould, for the faculty." In deference to the wishes of the majority the President changed the committees back.

Both sides agree that this incident of the committees was the beginning of serious trouble between the President and the faculty majority. Though the majority had not favored Dr. White's appointment to the presidency, they say that they were prepared to support the new administration.† But the President's action in

*One member of the minority (Professor Notestein) was put on eight committees, while two members of the majority (both heads of departments) were limited to one committee each, one of them quite unimportant so far as college policies are concerned. It may be added that it takes nineteen committees of from three to nine members each to manage the affairs of this College.

†Before the opening of the new session there may have been more or less imprudent talk. Certain faculty members are accused of saying that the President-elect would never be inaugurated, and he and his family are said to have said that he would soon get rid of his faculty opponents. The committee of inquiry has no direct evidence in support of either accusation.

the matter of the curriculum committee looked like a repudiation of his statement in June that so far as he was concerned the normal school issue was dead and that no educational policy would be pressed against the judgment of the faculty.

At the time of the trouble President White told Professor Martin (of the majority) that he had taken him off the committee on religious life because the committee was too large, and Professor Bennett afterwards testified that he (Bennett) had told the President that the committees, and especially the curriculum committee, were too large and unwieldy, and that President White had agreed with him. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the size of the committees had been discussed, and it is true that, though the average size of the committees as appointed by President White was not diminished, three of the largest of them were.

But if President White had been actuated solely by a desire to diminish the size of these committees he would hardly have added Trustee-Pastor Weir (who had no faculty standing whatever and who, as a trustee, could not be put upon the faculty without a violation of the by-laws of the corporation) to the committee on religious life after removing the two Bible professors (Martin and Vance, both of whom are Presbyterian ministers) from it; and he would hardly have appointed two minority men (Remp and Dickason, the principal of the academy who does no college teaching whatever) to the curriculum committee after removing from it four of the majority (Martin, Mateer, Archibald and Vance).

The curriculum committee, be it remembered, was a committee to mould college policies. The four majority men whom President White removed from this committee represented the best of training at Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, and Jena.* The two minority men whom he put in their place were graduates of Wooster, one of whom had also earned an A. M. at the University of Nebraska.

President White maintains that the change in the curriculum committee "had absolutely nothing to do with policies. The cur-

*Chalmers Martin, A. B., A. M., and D. D. (Princeton) taught for eight years in Princeton Theological Seminary and Princeton College; Horace N. Mateer, A. B., A. M. (Princeton), M. D. (University of Pennsylvania); Herbert T. Archibald, A. B. and A. M. (Dalhousie College), Ph. D. (Johns Hopkins); J. Milton Vance, A. B. (Lake Forest), B. D. (McCormick), Ph. D. (Jena).

riculum committee has no power to decide anything." But this is not the view of Professor Dickason, who says:

The administration blundered in allowing the curriculum committee to be changed back. If it could have been allowed to stand we could have arranged everything, without any trouble. . . . If I had been president, I'd have sent three or four of these men their dismissal, and that would have settled it.

President White says (interview of June 24th):

The President has appointed the faculty committees for many years. I had a committee of consultation that I appointed and had approved by the faculty. I got all the light I could from that committee and then from other sources, and after that I appointed committees, cutting down their size a bit. This was jumped upon as indicating a purpose to control policies. That was all foolish, for every committee has to report to the faculty. It had no power to do anything by itself. There was no question of majority or minority in my mind. When I found they cared so much about it, I changed it. For them to challenge the constitution of those committees was one of the main things that have led to strain all the year. . . . The change in the curriculum committee had absolutely nothing to do with policies. The curriculum committee has no power to decide anything.

QUESTION: Professor Dickason said he thought you had made a blunder in changing the curriculum committee back, since if it had remained, the things he wanted could have gone through without question.

ANSWER: I may have made a blunder of another sort, a tactical blunder in yielding to the majority of the faculty. I received a wire signed "Gould, for the faculty," when as a matter of fact it was only the majority faction of the faculty. They made charges. I yielded. I think I should have asked for a meeting of the whole faculty and talked it out there. The committee was not a nominating committee, but a committee of consultation. I used that name purposely in naming the committee. They had no right whatever to assume that their suggestions were final in the matter.

On July 29, 1916, President White wrote that "demanding a change by the administration in the personnel of the committees of the faculty" was one of the things that he objected to in the "caucusing" of the majority as "calculated to undermine and discredit his administration."

If the change in the curriculum committee "had absolutely nothing to do with policies," as the President maintains, it is difficult to see why he did not see his way clear in the first place, as a mere matter of courtesy, to accept the suggestions of the committee of consultation which he himself had named, or why the request that

he change the committees back should be calculated to undermine and discredit his administration.*

It may be stated incidentally that this was the fourth or fifth occasion within less than a year on which the advice of the faculty or its representatives had been asked and then ignored or rejected.

On April 20, 1915, the Presbytery of Cleveland, one of the largest and strongest in the state, had passed a unanimous resolution condemning the establishment of the normal course against the protest of the faculty and emphasizing the need of charter revision to free the College from the pressure of local business interests through the large local executive committee; and there had been more or less similar protest elsewhere (*e.g.* Marion Presbytery, reported April 17, 1915). In October, 1915, the Synod of Ohio met and the executive committee of the College presented to it the Board's annual report which had been read and approved by the executive committee on October 4. In this report the Board "earnestly recommends that no action be taken . . . by the Synod at present" upon the normal school issue, since the new President ought to have an opportunity "to study this question with the other members of the faculty without haste or embarrassment."

This "earnest recommendation" indicates that the normal school issue was not so dead as President White's statements of the previous June seemed to indicate, and inasmuch as the "other members of the faculty" with whom such a question would be studied would naturally be the curriculum committee, it is possible that the packing of that committee with minority members was not purely accidental.

According to this report the Board was "deeply gratified at the hearty reception given to Dr. White by the faculty" and others; "the happiest relations" existed between Dr. White and the faculty; no radical changes were going to be made without substantial agreement on the part of the faculty, and "in the atmosphere of mutual love and consideration" the wisest course was going to be found and followed.

*The theory held by supporters of the administration is that the President is the victim of a conspiracy. President Holden, they say, had developed a strong antagonism to Professor Dickason, and wished to get rid of him. The new state law gave him a chance to do this and to get rid of the Summer School as well; so he opposed the measure designed to save the school, and "the friends of Dr. Holden will not forgive the fact of a minority report, which, beyond all our foresight, led to Dr. Holden's accepted resignation.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL SENATE

As to the Summer School, the report assured the Synod that "the same high standard of thoroughness will be required in the summer work that is required during the rest of the year, these standards being under the direct control of the faculty of the College and the Academy."

The Synod appointed a committee to consider possible changes in the charter of the College, and at the instance of friends of the faculty it elected Rev. A. P. Higley of Cleveland to a vacant place on the Board of Trustees, but it respected the request of the Board and took no action on the question of the normal school or of the Summer School.

The kind of "direct control" exercised over the Summer School by "the faculty of the College and the Academy" can be judged by the following paragraph written to Dr. Higley shortly before a special meeting of the Board called for October 27, 1915: "The faculty wants to control the College work in the Summer School. This seems a legitimate demand, but certain interests here will fight that bitterly to the end."

Dr. Higley went to the meeting determined, if possible, to secure this right for the faculty, and he came away from the meeting with the belief that the right had been secured. But though it had been granted, it had not been secured at the meeting in question; the report of a committee on the Summer School was received and some of its provisions were modified and adopted. But the plan of organization as presented by the committee seemed designed to automatically attach faculty approval to matters over which the faculty had no control, and by way of substitute Professor Henderson* introduced a resolution explicitly stating that "the faculty of the college shall elect a committee to have charge of all college work offered in the Summer School and shall recommend the faculty in charge of such courses. This committee shall choose a director to correlate its work with that of the academy and normal sections."

This resolution was carried, and shortly after, October 27, 1915, the resolutions as passed were officially reported to the faculty, and on the basis of the trustee action thus communicated to it, the faculty, on November 2, elected its committee on the College section

*W. E. Henderson, Professor in Ohio State University, Wooster trustee.

of the Summer School. This committee, consisting of Dean Compton and Professors Yanney and Hunter, proceeded with its work, elected Professor Kelso director of the College section and planned the courses and the teaching staff of this section, ready for recommendation to the executive committee of the Board.

The committee of inquiry has never heard it alleged that the members of this committee failed in any way to discharge the duties committed to them with diligence and propriety; and it is certain that the Henderson resolution was intended to put the control of the College section of the Summer School into the hands of men satisfactory to the faculty majority. But from the testimony of President White it is clear that the election of these men was distasteful to him. At the end of about a month the faculty was apprised of the existence and functions of a "Summer School Senate" and of the fact that the recommendations of courses and instructors offered by the faculty's Summer School committee must be submitted to the jurisdiction of this senate. Still later the faculty was furnished with what purported to be a full account of the Trustee's action, in a paper headed "The Senate of the Wooster Summer School."

It appears that in the meeting of the Board certain details of Summer School organization had been left in the hands of the President and the executive committee, and that on the basis of this authority the President and executive committee adopted a plan which made the committee elected by the College faculty subordinate to a permanent "Summer School Senate" so appointed as to leave the representative of the college majority in a minority of one out of six. The plan was then reported to the faculty in a document so worded and arranged as to leave the impression that this subsequent work of the executive committee had been the work of the Board itself or at least approved by the Board on October 27.

The minutes of the Board for this meeting of October 27, as transmitted to its members are as follows:

The second item in the call for this meeting, that of making plans for the conduct of the Summer School, was taken up. The report of the committee of control of the Summer School as presented by its president and secretary was read. It was moved and adopted that the several items as recommended be taken up seriatim as follows:

- 1st. That the Summer School be continued. This was adopted with the addition of the following, "for the present."

2nd. Was approved to read as follows: "That it be continued in all three sections, as this year, with a director of each section. The director of the College section shall be elected by the Board of Trustees upon nomination of the faculty of the College."

3rd. Recommendation relating to the general plan of organization. By common consent it was decided to leave the details of organization in the hands of the President and executive committee.

4th. That the name of the President of the College appear at the head of the list of the faculty in the bulletins of the Summer School, this was adopted.

The following resolutions offered by Professor Henderson were adopted as the basis for the organization of the College section. The final organization of the three sections into a working plan was left to the President of the College and a committee of the faculty to be appointed by him, and the director of each section.

1st. The faculty of the College shall elect a committee to have charge of all college work offered in the Summer School, and shall recommend the faculty in charge of such courses. This committee shall choose a director to correlate its work with that of the academy and normal sections.

2nd. The record of credits in the College section, in the academy section and in the normal section shall be kept distinct from each other, and the distinction shall be preserved in all transcripts issued.

The subsequent recommendations made by the committee in their report was referred to the executive committee.*

The minutes as transmitted to the faculty shortly after October 27 are those just given, with the exception of the first sentence and the last paragraph, which were omitted. The document transmitted to the faculty a month later is as follows:

THE SENATE OF THE WOOSTER SUMMER SCHOOL

Item 1st. The action of the Board of Trustees taken October 27, 1915, constituting the Senate of the Summer School, and defining its work, is as follows:

The report of the Committee of Control of the Summer School as presented by its President and Secretary was read. It was moved and adopted that the several items as recommended be taken up seriatim as follows: 1st. That the Summer School be continued. This was adopted with the addition of the following, "for the present."

2nd. Was approved to read as follows: That it be continued in all three sections, as this year, with a director of each section, the director of the College section shall be elected by the Board of Trustees upon nomination of the faculty of the College.

3rd. Recommendation relating to the general plan of organization. By common consent it was decided to leave the details of organization in the hands of the President and the executive committee.

4th. That the name of the President of the College appear at the head of the list of the faculty in the bulletins of the Summer School; this was adopted.

The following resolutions offered by Professor Henderson were adopted as the basis for the organization of the College section. The final organization of the

*Some irrelevant matter is omitted.

three sections into a working plan was left to the President of the College and a committee of the faculty to be appointed by him, and the director of each section.

1. The faculty of the College shall elect a committee to have charge of all college work offered in the Summer School, and shall recommend the faculty in charge of each course. This committee shall choose a director to correlate its work with that of the academy and normal sections.

2. The record of credits in the College section, in the academy section and in the normal section shall be kept distinct from each other, and the distinction shall be preserved in all transcripts issued.

Item 2nd. The general plan of organization of the Summer School submitted to the Board of Trustees on October 27, and approved in general by them, the details being left in the hands of the President and the executive committee, was as follows:

That the Board of Trustees elect each year three members of the College faculty who, with the President of the College and the principal of the Summer School, elected by the Board of Trustees, shall constitute the Senate of the Summer School. The President of the College shall be president of the senate. This senate shall have the following duties:

1. To nominate to the Board of Trustees the instructors for the Summer School.
2. To determine what courses shall be offered, and to devise plans for the improvement of the Summer School.

3. To adopt and enforce the necessary regulations for securing and maintaining proper scholarship standards in the actual teaching of the Summer School.

4. To certify for students the work done and the credits deserved.

5. To report at the close of each Summer School to the Board of Trustees the work of the school, giving such special data as from time to time the Board may require.

Item 3rd. On November 1 the executive committee took the following action: A senate of the Summer School was proposed and on motion the following persons were elected to comprise same: Dr. J. O. Notestein, Dr. W. Z. Bennett, Prof. Luther Platt, Pres. J. Campbell White, and the three directors, and principal of Summer School. On motion Prof. J. H. Dickason was elected principal of the Summer School, Prof. L. C. Knight as director of the Academy section, and Prof. Martin Remp of the Normal section, the director of the College section to be nominated by the committee of the College faculty.

The senate was requested to submit to this body an estimated budget, together with their recommendations as to what charges should be made for tuition, room rent, boarding, etc., and any other items that might produce income to the College.

Principal Dickason was authorized to arrange for a tentative lecture course.

It will be noticed that all of the first item except its first paragraph is copied from the minutes of the Board's meeting of October 27. The other items are not in the minutes at all. It will be noticed also (from Item 2) that the Summer School Senate did not have to be in any sense representative of the College faculty—and from Item 3 it is very evident that it was not; for everyone of the persons named above was a member of the minority. The only

majority man would be the director of the College section. And it will be noticed, in the third place, that, in spite of the Henderson resolution, the nomination of instructors, the determination of the courses to be given, and the maintenance of proper standards, were all put into the hands of the Summer School Senate without any reservations whatever.

This second account of the action of the Board (supervening as it did upon the statement that recommendations of courses and instructors by the College faculty's Summer School committee must be submitted to the jurisdiction of the senate) was naturally disturbing to the faculty. Even as late as June, 1916, they were still asking such questions as these:

Did the Trustees on October 27, 1915, really take "action constituting the Senate of the Summer School and defining its work?" If so, is that "action" on their minutes, and why was not the faculty notified of it at the time? Why did the first alleged report of the Trustees' action contain no reference to a senate, and especially to one with superior authority? If the Board's action included an approval of all the details in Item 2, why is it stated merely that the "general plan" was "approved in general?" Did the Board really approve all these details or were they worked out afterwards by the President and executive committee? How can the senate "nominate to the Board of Trustees the instructors for the Summer School" when the Henderson resolution says they shall be recommended by the College faculty? How can the senate "determine what courses shall be offered," etc., when the Henderson resolution provides that the faculty committee shall have charge of all College work offered in the Summer School? How can the senate "adopt and enforce regulations" and "certify the students' work and credit" without encroaching on the charter rights of the faculty?

President White says (May 31, 1916):

At the very same meeting as that in which Professor Henderson made his motion about the College section of the Summer School the whole Board accepted the general principle of a senate that should have general charge of the whole Summer School. . . . [The Senate was appointed by the executive committee instead of letting the faculty select its own committee because] they thought that was the best way to get men who believed in the Summer School and who could give time to it. That was done by the whole Board though they left the details to be worked out by the executive committee."

These statements by President White were submitted to Professor Henderson, who says, in marginal comment, "The Senate

was not in any way created by the Board, nor did it provide for [its] appointment." Professor Henderson comments on the first paragraph of Item I as follows:

The Board took no action that constituted a senate. The action taken by the Board according to my memory was to pass upon Item I as a substitute or amendment for all the matter of Item II. . . . All this organization into a senate was part of the original plan, but was set aside by the action of Item I. . . . I am sure none of Item II was action of the Board, for it is in complete variance with Item I which was action. Item II was executive committee action.

In a fuller account of what took place at the meeting of the Board Professor Henderson writes as follows:

In regard to the Summer School: A document was presented to the Board comprising a plan of organization and administration. I think it was written by Professor Notestein. It provided for all the details of senate, etc., and we started in to consider it *seriatim* and modify it. After passing on some unimportant points we struck the item on organization—a senate designed to automatically attach faculty sanction to matters over which the faculty had no control. I vigorously objected to the whole paragraph as illegal and undemocratic. The paragraph was far too obscure and involved to be amended, and I finally offered as a substitute two motions: (1) A motion of principle, stating that the faculty should be supreme in all matters of collegiate work. (2) A motion to refer all matters of detail of organization to the President and executive committee, these to be framed in obedience to this principle. After much delay the executive committee evolved a plan and sent it to the faculty. This plan had about all the vicious qualities of the first one and in fact was merely a garbled form of it. I never saw this plan until all the trouble was over. When the faculty discovered that the plan was in plain violation of their rights, they for a time contested it, and then elected a Summer School committee favorable to the plans of Professor Dickason. This really gave, by faculty consent, the sanction that made the whole procedure legal. When I found this out there was no basis on which to raise a contest in the Board, for it could at once be said that the faculty had agreed to the plan.

It is true that the minutes of the Board make mention of a committee to be chosen in much the same way as that in which the Summer School Senate was afterwards chosen, but, if one is to go by the minutes, that committee's function was merely to organize the three sections into a working plan, not to exercise the permanent authority which the Henderson resolution had definitely given to the College faculty and the College committee, and which Messrs. Henderson and Higley both continued to believe that these latter possessed.

In view (1) of the known previous intentions of Dr. Higley, (2) of the very definite written statements of Professor Henderson, (3)

of equally emphatic and unambiguous verbal statements by Dr. Higley, (4) of the official minutes of the Board, confused though they be, and (5) of the original action of the administration in communicating the action of the Board to the faculty and setting it to work a month before anything was said about a senate, the committee of inquiry cannot avoid the conclusion that in spite of President White's statement of May 31 the whole Board did *not* accept "the general principle of a senate that should have general charge of the whole Summer School," but definitely rejected it. The committee of inquiry believes that the "Director of the College section . . . elected by the Board of Trustees upon nomination of the faculty of the College" was intended to direct, not merely to make recommendations to a "Senate" which the minutes say nothing about; and that the Henderson resolution meant to give the faculty and the faculty committee genuine and (under the Board) final jurisdiction. When that resolution said that the College faculty "shall recommend the faculty in charge of each course" in the Summer School, Professor Henderson meant "recommend them to the Board, or to the executive committee," not to a still non-existent senate or any other intermediate body clothed with superior (though probably illegal) jurisdiction, and there is every reason to believe that that was the understanding of the Board.

President White said on May 31, 1916, that the members of the College faculty of the Summer School "are recommended by the College committee and appointed by the Board or executive committee. The College faculty does control that section of the work. That management of the College section is satisfactory to the faculty, I think."

On the other hand the Summer School *Handbook of Information* (for 1916) says (p. 5):

The College faculty through a committee has immediate direction of the courses that will be offered for college credit and the selection of the instructors for the same, but this, with all other departments of the school, is under the management of the Summer School Senate of eight members of the College faculty appointed by the Board of Trustees.

This published statement seems to mean that the senate has (or had) the right to overrule the College committee on "the direction of the courses offered for college credit," and all other educational matters, and that the plain intention of the Board in passing the Henderson resolution had been defeated by the subsequent action

of the President and executive committee in giving superior authority to the senate.

Professor Kelso continued for some time to serve as Dean of the College section of the Summer School and *ipso facto* member of the senate, but finally he and the other members of the College committee resigned. They were replaced by a minority committee.

In June, 1916, the Trustees adopted an elaborate plan of organization for the Summer School, which leaves the senate in existence, but specifically excludes from its jurisdiction and preserves for the College committee all those functions which the Henderson resolution had evidently been intended to give to it, but which the scheme adopted by President White and the executive committee had handed over to the Summer School Senate.

TALES OF IMPENDING DISMISSALS

When President White accepted the call to Wooster, one of his published reasons was his desire to bring about better methods of Bible study among college students.

The Bible department at Wooster is advertised by President White as the strongest amongst American colleges, and it is stated by persons competent to judge of such matters that this department really is, perhaps not the strongest, but surely one of the strongest in any college. The three professors in the "Florence H. Severance Bible and Missionary Training School" have unusually good records. It may be added that all three of these professors are Presbyterian ministers, and their teaching appears to be reasonably conservative. The only graduate work which President White has to his credit is one year in the United Presbyterian Seminary, but his brother is head of the "Bible Teachers' Training School"* in New York. At about the beginning of the session of 1915-16 President White suggested that four men from this school be imported (one after the other) to give courses for college credit. The scheme was opposed and, after some insistence, he dropped it; but got a man from the school to come to the Academy for half the year. This man seems to have done very well, but the whole affair was managed in such a way as to create the impression for a time amongst members of the faculty and other citizens of Wooster, that President White intended to discredit Professor Vance and perhaps Professor Martin

*This school is described by competent persons as an evangelical training school with little or no standing amongst scholars.

also, two of the regular members of the Bible Department. The President denies that he had any such intention, and Professor Vance, who was principally concerned, has expressed a desire that the incident be regarded as closed. But at the time it aroused very serious apprehension.

While this was happening in the Bible Department, Professor Dickason, who was supposed to voice the sentiments of the administration, was talking about a long vacation for one or more of the Bible men and other members of the majority. The following letter to one of the trustees has reference to a conversation with Professor Dickason some time in the fall of 1915, probably in October. The writer is a prominent and respected citizen of Wooster.

TO REV. DR. HUDNUT, *Trustee of the College of Wooster*:

Upon your request I am making a statement regarding a conversation I had with Prof. J. H. Dickason some three or more months ago, relative to the affairs of the College of Wooster, in which he gave utterance to some criticisms of members of the College faculty. This conversation occurred on a trip to Columbus on which we left Wooster together.

On his own initiative, Professor Dickason began to unburden himself in reference to College affairs. I was greatly surprised at the freedom with which he talked, making no pretense of its being confidential. I was interested, of course, for I knew a little of the differences of opinion existing between the faculty and the trustees, though up to that time, I had heard nothing directly from a trustee or a member of the faculty.

Among the astounding statements he made to me which I distinctly remember are the following:

That a number of members of the College faculty would be given a long vacation soon. A number of names were mentioned including Hunter, Yanney and Vance, and, I feel quite sure, Dr. Martin. In rehearsing some gossip about the latter he asserted that Dr. Martin was "losing his mind."

That the President called him in before each meeting of the Trustees to talk things over and get his advice as to what he (the President) should do.

That he (Dickason) had picked out three recent additions to the faculty, and that the Trustees were ignoring his opponents on the faculty, reciting specific instances of proof of it.

My impression of this recital was that it showed, not only very bad taste, but a very bad spirit. My relations with Professor Dickason have never been of a confidential nature, and I have no reason to think he would tell me any thing he would not tell any one with whom he happened to fall in.

I repeated the substance of this conversation to one person only, aside from the President of the College (I am not certain that I gave quite all of the above to the President, though I did the greater part of it), and that in confidence, until I heard a report that one of the faculty above mentioned had been asked to resign. Then, fearing that the sniping-off policy had begun (I had not taken the conversation seriously before) I mentioned the matter to a member of the College faculty.

I am giving this information reluctantly, and with no wish to mix in the affairs of the College, but after years of association with Dean Compton, Dr. Martin, Dr. Vance, Dr. Kelso, Professor Yanney, and others of the faculty, I have learned to have great respect for them and am willing to do an unpleasant thing if any good can come from it.

Professor Dickason (June 12, 1916) denies most of the above story and denies quoting the President, except perhaps to say that he wished to make the institution of the greatest service to the state and was therefore "sympathetic with our desires to help the country teachers." But he admits that he may have said that matters "would never be settled until some left," and that he may even have mentioned several by name. He states that if anything was said about a long vacation it was that he (Dickason) "wished they might or that they ought to have such a vacation if they could not work in harmony with the College."

President White says (interviews of May 31 and June 24, 1916):

I never told even my wife, much less Professor Dickason, that some men here were marked for dismissal, and of course I never gave any names.

I called the talk with ——— to Dickason's attention again and he said, anything he said to ——— he said absolutely on his own responsibility. Dickason did not know anything about the Board. . . . Dickason has undoubtedly talked too freely about those men who are not in sympathy with the administration or with the things the institution was founded to do.

These statements made in May and June, 1916, by Professor Dickason and President White leave no doubt that on the occasion in question Professor Dickason had made remarks of some sort about dismissals in store for his colleagues; and, the letter of our unnamed witness makes it clear that other talk of dismissals was in the air soon afterwards. After the sudden dismissal of Miss Hughes on January 1, the condition became such that President White himself afterwards referred to it as one of "panic."

The committee of inquiry does not know when the gentleman whose letter we have quoted communicated Professor Dickason's remarks to President White. But, according to a carefully prepared contemporary document, on the evening of January 28, 1916, President White rebuked the faculty petitioners (See p. 50 ff.) for charging that Professor Dickason had made them, because, as he said, Professor Dickason had denied making them and the charge was not supported.

A few days after this interview of January 28, between the petitioners and President White, there was a meeting of the full Board of

Trustees at which it seems to have been more or less definitely understood that President White should announce to the faculty that no further removal of teachers was contemplated at that time. The Board took no action to that effect, but Dr. Higley testifies that no motion to that effect was made because President White made it clear that none would be necessary. President White consulted Dean Compton about the wisdom of making an announcement to the faculty, but in spite of his advice no such announcement was made. He says (June 24, 1916):

The Board did not tell me to tell the men that there would be no more dismissals this year; though there was a general feeling that we had better proceed in a different way.* There was a growing feeling that the method should be changed. It was my own feeling as well as that of the Board that we had better get over this panic. But there was certainly no official action, and I had no instructions, either formal or informal, from the Board. Some of these men have been raising the devil. We have been awfully patient. I have had from all over the country suggestions that we could not tolerate this insubordination. I was criticized for being too lenient and letting them breed anarchy among the students and town people and alumni.

It will be remembered that, partly by intimidation, on the evening of January 28, President White had been able to make members of the faculty withdraw their petition in favor of Miss Hughes. His failure to announce that there would be no further dismissals and the reasons that he assigns for it, make it hard to avoid the conclusion that he did not wish to surrender so valuable a weapon.

"INSUBORDINATION"

But how had the men been "insubordinate" and breeding "anarchy" and "raising the devil"? They had made a dignified protest against the normal school policy in the spring of 1915; they had given their honest opinions when Dr. White consulted them about accepting the presidency; they had protested against the packing of committees, especially the curriculum committee; they had elected persons whom they trusted to manage the College section of the Summer School, as the Board of Trustees had clearly intended that they should; and when the situation seemed ominous they had presented a respectful petition, asking for the reconsideration of Miss Hughes' case and for legislation intended to protect themselves from a similar summary dismissal. All of these things except the first two, (which took place before the administration

*The first part of this statement is confirmed by Professor Henderson.

began) were objected to by the President. The Hughes petition, he said, "was not being presented on its merits," but presented by a segment of the faculty some of whom "suspected that there would probably be others who would be dismissed, and there was a tendency to challenge the first dismissal and stop the process." Moreover, the petition "was being presented by a group to the administration without consulting the administration, practically as a challenge to the administration, and I didn't like the procedure."

As to the second half of the petition, by which the faculty petitioners hoped to protect themselves against the sort of thing threatened by Professor Dickason, President White had no fault to find with its substance; but, "I thought there was a large impropriety in their suggesting a completely wrought out and printed* method of procedure in appointing and dismissing professors without even consulting me. That presentation of a method in its completed form assumed I had no ideas to contribute to the making of it. I think I resented that." (May 31, 1916.)

But apparently the most objectionable thing of all on the part of the majority was any concerted action to prevent the adoption of a Summer School policy which they (the majority) regarded as ruin to the College. Speaking of the evening of January 28, President White says (May 31, 1916):

I charged them definitely with caucusing before faculty meeting and told them I would not stand for anything of the sort, that there would be war if there was any more caucusing. These men had decided upon the personnel of the committee [to manage the College Section of the Summer School] before they went into the faculty meeting, and put the thing right through. I saw it instantly from the chair. That is neither democratic nor Christian. It is caucusing, and deciding that they have a majority, and they can do a thing and they will do it—and I won't stand for it.

On the night of January 28, 1916, President White made remarks about this offense of caucusing which left the impression that he objected not only to joint action on the part of the majority but even to private discussion by them of College matters. "He insisted that in no case should any part of the faculty meet to discuss matters without the presence of all. Such caucuses, he repeatedly said, have got to cease." President White says, in effect, that this is a misinterpretation of his remarks. But the fact remains that as

*This may mean type-written. The committee of inquiry has seen no printed document of the sort.

a result of his remarks "free discussion has been driven to cover. All meetings have been held behind closed blinds and little news of them has been permitted to go abroad."

It may be added that President White testifies that on the evening of January 28 there was no threat against any man and that he would not think there was anything threatening to the petitioners in his manner or in anything that was said, though "there may have been in the whole situation an indication that I was President of the College and did not propose to have all these questions settled by any group of the faculty."

All this is far enough from "the atmosphere of mutual love and consideration" in which President White and the executive committee had told the Synod that outstanding problems would be solved with the faculty. But we believe it gives a very fair conception of a common attitude of President White and some of the local trustees toward the faculty majority: It must not protest to the Board against a wrong done to a colleague; or get up a petition without previous consent; or insist that the faculty's presiding officer make faculty committees fairly representative of the prevailing sentiment in the faculty itself; or arrange to elect men representing that prevailing sentiment to the one committee that the Board had distinctly said should be elected; or refuse to surrender the responsibilities imposed upon it by the law of the land and the charter of the College.

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY

It will be remembered that when the faculty petitioners of January 28, 1916, withdrew that part of their petition which had to do with Miss Hughes, President White promised to present to the Board the part which had to do with faculty appointments, promotions and dismissals. This contained a request for the University of Pennsylvania plan, providing that no professor or assistant professor should be dismissed without a previous hearing before a committee consisting partly of trustees and partly of representatives elected by the faculty; and in order to carry out any such plan, it was necessary to know very definitely whom the voting portion of the faculty included. The by-laws of the Board contain the following rule:—

No professor or instructor shall be a voting member of the faculty unless previously designated by name as such by the Board of Trustees, nor shall any professor emeritus be entitled to a vote in the faculty.

During the administration of President Holden, this rule had been disregarded, and there were persons in the faculty who did not know whether they had been designated as voters or not. But now votes counted, and there seems to have been fear that Academy and Conservatory teachers would be brought in to vote in increasing numbers. The faculty majority therefore requested in effect that the franchise be given (and limited) to the Dean of the College, the Dean of Women and all professors and assistant professors in the College.*

On February 1, the full Board of Trustees met and, as we have seen, there was a lively discussion of the question of a hearing for Miss Hughes. At that meeting the faculty plan of a joint committee of trustees and professors, to consider appointments, promotions, and dismissals before these were finally acted upon by the Board, was also discussed and favorably considered, though there was no formal action upon the matter until June. President White also proposed a general rule by which voting membership of the faculty should be determined, and it was passed with very little discussion. But the result of the meeting was to bring dismay to the faculty majority, who felt that they had been betrayed. One contemporary writer stated that "a faculty easily three-fourths anti-normal" had been "converted into one in which the vote would be about an even draw on the issue of the whole past year, which is not a dead issue, by any manner of means." Apparently however, things were not quite so bad as he supposed. Writing on May 18 (1916), another member of the faculty says that before February 2 the vote was 22 to 7; after February 2, 15 to 9, still in favor of the majority. How did this come about?

Briefly summarized, the facts are as follows: The Registrar, the Dean of Women, and the Director of Physical Culture (all majority members) were disfranchised; Professor Dickason and another academy teacher who have titular chairs in the College but do no work in it (both minority members) were left with their votes undisturbed; two minority men were promoted to assistant professorships in spite of slender academic records, and in this way one of them was enfranchised or escaped disfranchisement, though, through an oversight, the other was left without a vote; two majority

* This is written partly from a verbal statement. The committee of inquiry has not seen the document.

men with obviously better technical training were left unpromoted and were therefore disfranchised.*

The four minority members here referred to had Wooster degrees, two A. M., one Ph. B., and one B. S. None of them had records in the "Biographical Sketches" of graduate study outside of Wooster, even at a Summer School. The committee of inquiry does not know the conditions under which Wooster granted the A. M. Every one of the five disfranchised majority members here referred to had taken at least two degrees (including one case of a Wooster A. M.) and every one of them had a record of honest work towards a second or third degree at some place or places other than Wooster, including Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Bryn Mawr, University of Wisconsin, Ohio State University, Case School of Applied Science, and the International Y. M. C. A. College (for work in physical education). At a rough estimate they would average two and one half years apiece of graduate work (not including the work, if any, for the Wooster A. M., and not including summer school work at Harvard, Cornell, Woods Hole, Syracuse).

It should perhaps be added that the Director of the Conservatory of Music (apparently a majority man) who is a fellow of the American Guild of Organists and holds the degree of Mus. B. from the University of the State of New York (by its Regents), and the Professor of Vocal Music (a minority man with no degree), were left undisturbed.

There is no doubt in the minds of the majority that President White packed the faculty committees in September, and that now he was packing the faculty itself. This is denied by the minority. What are the facts in the individual cases?

The Registrar, the Dean of Women, and the Director of Physical Culture, who had voted ever since they came to the College, were disfranchised. The Registrar was a Johns Hopkins Ph. D. and had held a full professorship elsewhere. It is stated that when he came to Wooster he had been promised voting membership in the faculty by President Holden, and he had certainly exercised it without question as long as President Holden remained. His disfranchise

* These, of course, were not the only instructors disfranchised, but so far as we are aware they are, with one exception, the only ones whose non-promotion has been seriously criticized or discussed. The exception is a man who has been classed with the majority, whose case is quite unique and cannot profitably be discussed by the committee in this connection.

ment, however, seems to have been involved in the plan submitted by the faculty majority, and could not therefore be criticized by them if it had stood alone. As a matter of fact he broke down at about this time and afterwards resigned. His place has been given to Rev. C. R. Compton, a brother-in-law of President White.

Miss Hughes, the Dean of Women, held the degrees of Ph. B. and A. M. from Wooster, and since receiving them had had two and a half years of graduate work at Chicago and a graduate fellowship at Bryn Mawr. As instructor at Mount Holyoke, she had been a voting member of the faculty. When she accepted the deanship at Wooster it was taken for granted that the position was to be one of dignity, and before she went to her first faculty meeting, in the autumn of 1912, President Holden stated that of course she would go to faculty meetings and have a voice and vote. From that time until after the meeting of the Board in February 1916, she always voted at all meetings of the faculty and her right to do so was never questioned. We are told that she also served on several important committees.

E. A. Bauer, B. S., B. P. E., the Director of Physical Education, was Assistant Physical Director at Ohio State University from 1909 to 1912, when he went to Wooster. He writes in answer to the committee of inquiry's questions that when he took the Wooster position it was understood that if his work proved satisfactory he would be recognized in his second year as a member of the faculty, like other heads of departments. This is confirmed by Dr. Mateer who was chairman of the committee that recommended Mr. Bauer. He states that "Bauer was to be head of a department and professor. That was undoubtedly understood—Yes, it was President Holden's understanding that Bauer should have a vote and the title of professor." In his second year Mr. Bauer went to Dr. Holden who told him that he had been made a professor by the Board and had a vote. This was understood also by the rest of the faculty, and for two years he appeared in the catalogue as Professor of Physical Education.* When the majority submitted their plan they had no thought of Mr. Bauer being disfranchised.

It appears, however, that through some blunder President Holden had either failed to secure action by the Board when he thought he

*The catalogue is edited by a faculty committee, but it is the custom of this committee to obtain from the President or the Secretary of the Board official information concerning titles of members of the teaching staff.

had done so or failed to have the action recorded. This became known to President White, who informed Mr. Bauer some time after February 2 (1916) that he had neither vote nor professorship. Mr. Bauer has since resigned.* He was regarded by his colleagues as a valuable man.

In the Department of Mathematics were two instructors, one belonging to the majority and the other to the minority. Without consulting the head of the department, who was of the majority, President White procured the promotion of the minority instructor to an assistant professorship and left the majority instructor unpromoted and therefore disfranchised. Mr. Thomas, the majority man, was thirty-three years of age, had taken the degree of B. S. in 1909 from Mount Union College, where he had had full advanced courses in mathematics, and the degree of B. E. E. from Case School of Applied Science (1911), and had completed the residence work for the degree of E. E. from Wisconsin. He is a member of the Mathematical Association of America and of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education. He had taught at Wooster "with satisfaction to his chief, to the faculty, and to all his students who will work." The minority man, whom President White got the Board to promote, was nearly forty-five years of age, he had taken the degree of Ph. B. at Wooster in 1904, and had taught in the Wooster Academy from 1903 to 1911, at which time both he and Mr. Thomas received their College instructorships. He has also rendered service to Professor Dickason in the Summer School. He had

*In the summer of 1916 Mr. Bauer received a call at a much better salary to the Kansas State Agricultural College.

He says that when he took the matter up with one of the local trustees the trustee "stated that due to the fact that I had given information to the committee of the American Association of University Professors, rather than going directly to the Trustees with any complaint or request, that they would be disinclined to do anything for me, and that I was not in harmony with my chief, consequently I had better go. I was not in harmony with many of President White's policies, and I felt that instead of being pushed out just because of that, it would be better to accept a good opening at the present time, so when the offer was made for the present position, I accepted. I feel, however, that had I been on the minority side, or even remained absolutely neutral, when I still had a vote on the faculty, I would not have been demoted, and that my requests for an increase in salary would have been granted."

It is true that Mr. Bauer gave information to the committee of inquiry when they asked for it, as did President White, Professor Notestein, Professor Dickason, and other members of the minority (not to mention the local trustees themselves).

no record of any graduate work, and the records do not show that in college he had any mathematics beyond the first two years. It is stated that at the time of his appointment he knew no calculus; but in the summer of 1916 he went to Columbia to study it. He is described as a hard-working, self-sacrificing man, and is popular with the students. Both men are personally desirable. But the head of the department was ignored and the untrained minority man was promoted while the trained majority man was disfranchised.

President White says in defense of this promotion, "——— has been teaching here longer than any other man who has not been advanced and doing far more outside of the class room than any other professor. He had large evening classes without any compensation. It was simply a recognition in the mind of the Board that was long overdue. Then his contact with the students in athletics has been very intimate. He has rendered greater service to the whole student body than almost any other professor. If you are accenting student service, you have to recognize it when it is conspicuously displayed by a professor. This administration is ready to stand or fall by the service it renders to the individual student in every vital way."

Whether it pays an institution in the long run to give titles instead of money for extra drudgery, and whether intimate contact in athletics is a better kind of service to students from a professor of mathematics than years of special study are questions that the committee of inquiry does not care to discuss. It has nothing but sympathy and respect for this useful and hard-working man. But it cannot believe that this man would have been promoted and the other one disfranchised if their positions on College policies had been reversed.

Another contrast can be drawn, though the case here is not so clear, between Mr. Morris, an Instructor in Chemistry who was not promoted and was therefore disfranchised, and an Academy instructor who was made Assistant Professor of Botany. The Instructor in Chemistry was a majority man under a minority chief. He had the degrees of A. B. (1905) and A. M. (1908) from Ohio State University and had been Assistant Professor of Chemistry at the State College of Washington for over two years when he went to Wooster in February, 1912, and had also served as Instructor at Ohio State University in the summer of 1913. He is admittedly an able man, and has since resigned. The man in botany had done

no graduate work at the time of his appointment and had no college credit for any work whatever in botany. But he had been student Assistant in Biology at Wooster and for two years after his graduation in 1913 he had been College Instructor in Biology, though at the time of his appointment to the assistant professorship of Botany he was teaching only in the Academy, and was, of course, regarded as a supporter of Professor Dickason's policies. This appointment was not wholly unreasonable but it was very much criticized, especially in view of the fact that, according to President White's first announcement, the appointment carried a vote. It appears, however, that after procuring the appointment President White forgot to have the man named individually for a vote, as the rule still required. Dr. White's statement to this effect to the committee of inquiry and his original announcement to the faculty leave little doubt that when he recommended the appointment to the Board he understood that it was to carry a vote, though, of course, that does not necessarily mean that the appointment was made for the sake of the vote.* In any one instance it would be hard to prove that that was so, but when one considers all the promotions and disfranchisements, it is clear that if President White was not working for faculty control he showed an inexplicable disregard of the considerations likely to procure the Phi Beta Kappa recognition which he was at this time so anxious to secure.

One unfortunate thing about the botany appointment is that in bringing it about President White seems to have quoted two of his

*The statement in defense of this appointment that it was made to meet an emergency is true; but in all probability the emergency could have been met without giving the man a title and a permanent position. In a letter from Professor Notestein, which had been read and approved by President White, it is stated that when Dr. White advised this appointment, "he added the condition that at the end of this year, Professor ——— should continue graduate study of botany at one of the great universities." This is not correct. Professor ——— says that it was already his purpose "to pursue graduate study during the summer of 1916"; and this may have been known to some of the Trustees. But the gentleman in question knew absolutely nothing about his appointment until after it was made, and when it was announced to him nothing was said about any condition whatever. This disposes also of another minority statement, that he had demanded an assistant professorship, a vote, and more salary as a condition of remaining in Wooster. He had demanded nothing. It should be added that Professor ——— seems to be a good man in every respect except technical training. In botany he had managed in one way and another to do a considerable amount of work for which he had never received any credit, and in the summer of 1916 he made a very good record indeed at the University of Chicago.

colleagues, Dr. Mateer (Professor of Biology) and Dean Compton, rather inaccurately. Professor Henderson says that when President White recommended the appointment he (Henderson) challenged it, and Dr. White replied. "As I recollect them, Dr. White's words were 'I have consulted Dr. Mateer and —— is entirely satisfactory to him.' Certainly these words convey the impression conveyed to me." Dr. Higley also testifies that President White stated that Dr. Mateer had recommended the appointment. Dr. Mateer's testimony is as follows:

Dr. White asked me if I knew of anyone qualified for a position in biology in —— College. After thinking it over for a couple of days I said: "If they do not want a Ph. D. but only a twelve hundred dollar man, —— would be all right for the position." Then he asked me if his religious activities were satisfactory. I answered, "Yes." He asked me if we could afford to let him go. I answered that I always tried to consider the interests of the man himself in a case of that sort. Dr. White said he would write to —— College and I thought that ended it. That is all I had to do with the matter personally. (June 22, 1916.)

In an interview on June 24, President White was asked "how about the statement that you misquoted Dr. Mateer to the Board about ——?" He replied:

I said he had been recommended by Mateer for the professorship of biology in —— College, and also that Mateer would be glad to have him back in his department of biology. There was just a shade of difference and I was misunderstood. Nothing but a stenographic report would indicate which was mistaken. The misunderstanding about Compton's attitude to —— is another case of a shade of meaning. Compton recommended that he be put into the work for the rest of the year, but made no recommendation as to his title. Some people assume I quoted him about the title. There is the same difference here about a shade of meaning or emphasis.

In spite of this explanation by President White, Professor Henderson insists that the name of the College was not mentioned and that Dr. Mateer's recommendation was applied to the prospective place at Wooster in the words already quoted.

President White's misquotation of Dr. Mateer may not have been intentional. If President White's mind was fixed on "Christian activities," "teaching ability" and "influence over students"*

*Under date of December 7, 1916, President White writes as follows: "Mr. —— did not demand promotion or even ask for it. The President of —— College asked me to recommend a suitable man to teach Biology. I asked advice of Dr. Mateer, our biology professor, and he, after some days of consideration of the matter, recommended Mr. ——." As both Dr. Mateer and I knew the President

it is quite possible that he overlooked the distinction which Dr. Mateer and other men of academic experience would naturally make between biology and botany, between an instructorship and a professorship and between the standards of scholarship demanded in different institutions; and thus he may perhaps have misunderstood him.

As to the "misunderstanding" about Dean Compton, there can be no doubt that President White consulted him, and it is probable that on the strength of what President White said about Dr. Mateer, Dean Compton agreed that it would be wise to put Mr. ——— in charge of the Botany for the rest of the year, though he recommended that his record be looked into. But at the same time, Dean Compton called President White's attention to the injustice of making this man an assistant professor and leaving such men as Morris and Thomas (the men in Chemistry and Mathematics who were not promoted) in the rank of instructors. This is verified by President White. Yet at the time of the Board's action, President White seems to have entirely forgotten this part of the conversation, for on February 18 (1916) he wrote Dr. Higley as follows: "Both Dr. Black and Dean Compton were consulted before Mr. ——— was made Assistant Professor of Botany and both approved of the action."

Some time after the appointment of the man in Botany and the man in Mathematics to assistant professorships, he called Messrs. Morris and Thomas into his office separately and told each of them that when these two men were promoted the case of the man he was talking to had never entered his mind or the mind of the local Board [i.e. the executive committee.] Each of these men (Morris and Thomas) testifies that President White added, "I am prepared to recommend you for an assistant professorship." That would of ——— College very well, I assumed that our joint recommendation of Mr. ——— would get him the position. The suggestion that he be recommended to another college challenged me to make a careful study of Mr. ———'s teaching ability and influence over students, with the result that I decided that we could not afford to spare him. As we were in urgent need at that very time of a man to teach botany, and the head of the botany department recommended Mr. ——— for the work, I recommended him to the executive committee [it came before the full Board] for appointment as an assistant professor. All this was done without Mr. ——— having anything to do with it whatever, except to fall in line with our request."

have come in June. But at that time there was much controversy and no promotions were made.*

As already stated, the rule giving and limiting votes to professors and assistant professors was put through the Board with very little discussion. According to one trustee, however (Henderson), President White said in the meeting that this voting legislation was a purely formal action. Against this, we have the following statement by President White (interview of June 24):

I don't think I ever told the Beard that the rule was purely formal. I don't think the question of whether it shifted the majority and minority was raised at all. I told them that we were making a rule confining the vote to all professors and assistant professors, and the names I suggested were that complete list without exception.†

*President White writes as follows (July 3, 1916):

"The only other point you raise, I think, is with reference to Dean Compton suggesting to me in connection with the proposal to make Mr. ——— an assistant professor, that probably Mr. Thomas and Mr. Morris who had served longer would also be entitled to it if it were given to Professor ———. I am inclined to think that the Dean did make some such remark in the conversation, but it would need to be remembered that there was then no controversy whatever about any of these promotions and we were not anticipating trouble of any kind and I did not at that time have my lesson of how seriously action of this kind might be taken with some men advanced without others being given equal recognition. I think I explained to you that Professor ———'s whole case was very exceptional and in the nature of meeting an emergency. I was therefore considering his case by itself without any reference to what other men ought also to be advanced. We were not refusing to advance Morris and Thomas. Such a thought as this never entered my mind nor that, I think, of any other member of the Board, though this was the interpretation given to our action in the anonymous circular. It was not the time of year when any general changes would normally be made in the standing of the teaching staff. Naturally the time of that would be at the June meeting of the Board. While, therefore, I have the impression that Dean Compton did make some such remark as I have indicated above it did not at that time take any particular hold of my mind as something that must be given serious consideration then." As we have already stated, there really was an emergency that demanded an appointment of some sort in botany. But if this "was not the time of year when any general changes would normally be made in the standing of the teaching staff," why was it chosen for the promotion of the minority instructor in mathematics?

†President White explained here that the old rule providing that voting members of the faculty must be named by the Board still stands. He secured the adoption of this other rule about professors and assistant professors, and then named all the men that came under it.

A further statement from Professor Henderson is as follows:

This action was brought about in the closing minutes of a meeting at almost midnight, after a number of members had retired. It was my distinct understanding that it was merely *pro forma*, and was to cure technical defects in the right to vote. It never occurred to me, or to others as I now know, that anyone was affected. I must assume responsibility for not raising more questions, but the whole manner of presentation, the time, and the mood of the Board disarmed suspicion. There was no reason for supposing that such a radical move would take place, and the list of names was not even read, since it was stated that the aim was merely to cure the defect existing in its records. (January, 1917.)

Whatever words may or may not have been used in the Board, the fact remains that on the evening of January 28, 1916, President White rebuked the faculty majority with great heat for making use of its strength as a majority by caucusing, and that four or five days later, on February 1 or 2, he made certain recommendations to the Board, all of which tended to weaken the majority or strengthen the minority, and that he allowed these recommendations to pass without explaining to the Board that they had this tendency or pointing out the sense of injustice that they were sure to arouse in certain individuals and in the majority as a whole. In view of the President's attitude towards the majority it is difficult to believe that he could have carried through this reorganization of the faculty without recognizing its party significance.

"THE WOOSTER VOICE"

After the question of votes was settled in the Board, President White subjected his disfranchised colleagues to unnecessary humiliation.

Miss Hughes writes as follows (May 20, 1916):

"At the meeting of the faculty soon after the February, 1916, meeting of the Board of Trustees, the question of the names of the voting members of the faculty was brought up. Mr. White had the list in his hands but he would not read it. He suggested that the list be posted on the faculty bulletin board. One of the members of the faculty, Dr. Martin, objected, saying that this was a faculty matter, and not one for the students. For the sake of the members of the faculty who have no vote, it should not be placed on a public bulletin board. Mr. White apparently agreed and said he would send a list to all members of the faculty. In the *Wooster Voice*, February 24, 1916, a student publication, a copy of which

I send you, the list of the names of the voting members of the faculty was published. That is the only communication of any sort I have received. I am told that some time after this list was published in the students' paper, a notification was given to those who were to have the vote. . . . Of all the indignities which have come to me this year the one which has been the most galling and the most humiliating has been that of having my vote taken away from me."*

The editor of the *Voice*, writes (May 29, 1916): "The list of voting professors published in the *Voice* of February 24, was copied from a typewritten list furnished us by the President's office."

When President White was asked about this publication of the list in the *Voice*, he replied, "Do you think it would have been possible to bring that by-law into operation without jarring somebody? The faculty themselves were very eager to have the by-law put into operation. They had themselves asked it. They got up a list a little different from ours, but the principle was the same. I do not think they had asked me not to make it a matter of student knowledge. I accepted their suggestion that it should not be posted on the bulletin board, but think the papers already had the list of the voting members. There was no attempt to make it public. Merely newspaper alertness for news. We wanted to save all the feelings possible." (Interview of June 24.)

A careful examination shows that no list had been published in the local papers.

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE SYNOD OF OHIO

Four documents concerning the College of Wooster were presented to the Synod of Ohio at its annual meeting, October, 1916.

(A) The report of the permanent committee on the College of Wooster and the College Board. This is a purely perfunctory report based largely upon material in the report of the Board of

* This article in the *Voice* begins as follows:

"At their regular February meeting last week, the Board of Trustees, in accordance with Article 4, Section 1 of the by-laws of the College of Wooster, designated those members of the faculty who shall have the power to vote. Many students are unaware that all professors are not full fledged members of the faculty. Only those designated by the Trustees have a real voice in the matters upon which the faculty acts.

"The 26 voting members of the faculty now are:" etc.

The first sentence does not look like the work of a student.

Trustees, and notable for the ignorance which it displays of the real situation in the College.

(B) The report of the special committee, appointed in October, 1915, to consider changes in the charter of the College. This report made four recommendations, which were adopted:

(1) That the charter be amended to limit the Wayne County trustees to seven [summarized].

(2) In view of the fact that the College of Wooster has so amended its constitution and by-laws as to provide that before a professor, assistant professor or other teacher shall be removed or discharged, a hearing shall be had before a committee composed of representatives from the faculty and Board of Trustees, that Synod recommends to the College of Wooster that it also consider such additional changes in its constitution and by-laws as shall provide that no professor, assistant professor or other teacher be employed, promoted or demoted without the recommendations of the same committee.

(3) That Synod recommends to the College of Wooster, with due regard to all interests concerned, that they seriously consider the advisability of discontinuing its preparatory department.

(4) That [summarized] the College be supported, to the end the aim of the fathers be realized . . . and that an institution of learning under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church may be attained and maintained with such standards of education as will make it second to none.

The chairman of this special committee was Judge John E. West, a member of the Board of Trustees of the College, its report was made after conference with the College administration, and is referred to at length in the Report of the Board of Trustees.

(C) A petition from Mr. Sheldon Parks (a trustee of the College whose term of office expired with this meeting) that the Synod reverse the action of the Board of Trustees in the case of Miss Hughes, provide that in future there shall be no removals of professors or instructors without a trial before a faculty committee, abolish the Summer School, and restrain the Board from entering upon certain policies.

(D) The Report of the Board of Trustees. This is signed by "David A. Heron, Secretary of Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio," and "was read before the executive committee, at its meeting Saturday, October 7, 1916, and was ordered transmitted to the Synod in its present form."

We quote from this printed report to the Synod of Ohio at considerable length, numbering the paragraphs and sentences quoted, and commenting upon them.

(1) The committee appointed by the last Synod "to whom all overtures and other matters pertaining to charter revision" were referred, with instructions to report to the Synod of 1916, have graciously presented to the Board of Trustees the results of their study. The Board of Trustees has already taken official action endorsing all three of the recommendations that have been made by Synod's Special Committee.

Comment: The administration has not carried out any of the recommendations as the Synod committee very obviously intended that they should be carried out.

(2) With reference to the first recommendation that the number of trustees resident in Wayne County be reduced to seven, it is worthy of note that in the report of the Board of Trustees to Synod last year, the following sentence occurs (see page 13 of Report), "It is also the definite purpose of the Board to reduce the number of trustees resident in Wayne County to seven, the number required by the charter.

Comment: See Paragraph No. 16.

(3) Concerning the second recommendation, that members of the faculty be consulted in the matter of securing new members of the teaching staff, this is already the fixed policy of the administration. As vacancies occur, the President and Board of Trustees will most cordially welcome all possible help from the faculty and any other interested parties in securing for the College of Wooster the most competent Christian teachers to be found anywhere.

Comment: The recommendation was not that "members of the faculty" "and any other interested parties" "be consulted in the matter of securing new members of the teaching staff," but that no appointments, promotions or demotions be made without the recommendation of a joint committee consisting of trustees and representatives elected by the faculty. The administration has blocked the appointment of such a committee, as we shall see.

(4) With reference to the third recommendation that the "College of Wooster seriously consider the advisability of discontinuing its preparatory department," it is to be noted that Synod's Special Committee does not itself go so far as to recommend the discontinuance of this department, but merely recommends that the College itself give serious consideration to the matter.

Comment: This appears to the committee of inquiry to be a mere evasion. A well-equipped coeducational Academy under Presbyterian auspices has recently been established at Hudson, Ohio.

(5) It seems to the Board of Trustees a matter of satisfaction and congratulation that, after studying the whole situation for a year, the Special Committee of

the Synod has no suggestion to make that does not have the hearty approval of the Board of Trustees itself, and that in two out of the three recommendations, the actual working policy of the Board already accords with the spirit of the recommendations of Synod's Special Committee.

Comment: How far the last sentence is from the facts may be judged from what has preceded and what follows.

(6) With reference to "the petition of Mr. Sheldon Parks to reorganize the Board of Trustees of Wooster College and to effect certain reforms in the administration of Wooster College," which petition has been sent out widely throughout the Synod, the Board of Trustees would call attention to the following facts and considerations:

(7) 1. For the past year, the Synod of Ohio has had a special committee of seven men studying in great detail and with remarkable thoroughness the entire situation at the College of Wooster, and the Board of Trustees has already officially approved all of the findings and recommendations of this special committee [See Comments to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.] It would seem that such a committee was very much more likely to arrive at a proper understanding of the situation than any single individual would be.

(8) 2. As rapidly as it can be accomplished, the Board of Trustees intends to have each of the Presbyteries of the Synod represented on the Board. . . .

Comment: See Paragraph 16.

(9) 3. Concerning the method of dismissing members of the faculty, the Board has already taken official action in the exact terms suggested by the faculty at the College of Wooster itself, and in complete accord with the most advanced policy proposed by the Association of American University Professors.

Comment: The administration and the faculty do not agree as to the action taken (see below); and there is no warrant for the statement that the Board's action is in complete accord with the most advanced policy proposed by the American Association of University Professors. The policy proposed by the Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure is as follows:

"Judicial Hearings Before Dismissal. Every university or college teacher should be entitled, before dismissal or demotion, to have the charges against him stated in writing in specific terms and to have a fair trial on those charges before a special or permanent judicial committee chosen by the faculty senate or council, or by the faculty at large. At such trial the teacher accused should have full opportunity to present evidence, and, if the charge is one of professional incompetency, a formal report upon his work should be first made in writing by the teachers of his own department

and of cognate departments in the university, and, if the teacher concerned so desire, by a committee of his fellow specialists from other institutions, appointed by some competent authority." This paragraph, quoted from the official publications of the association, is to be found in a communication mailed by Mr. Parks to every member of the Board on June 5, 1916.

(10) . . . In 1915, the controversy was occasioned by the proposal to eliminate the Summer School.

Comment: The proposal was not "to eliminate the Summer School," but to save its large attendance by inaugurating a two-year normal school.

(11) . . . The Board of Trustees itself has never been more completely united in its spirit and purpose than it is now.

Comment: See Nos. 6 and 12. At the time the report was written Mr. Parks was still a member of the Board. The committee of inquiry has gained the impression that there is the utmost divergence of spirit and purpose in the Board of Trustees.

(12) The Board of Trustees would suggest to the Synod, that it put itself on record as strongly opposed to the sending out to the alumni and friends of the College, and to the pastors and elders of the Synod, of such documents as the anonymous letter sent out during the year, and of this signed letter of Mr. Sheldon Parks.

(13) Before any such publicity is given to such documents, the Board would urge that any complaint be made first to the Board, and then if necessary to the Synod itself. Such a course would be regular, dignified, and fair to the College, and would help enormously to prevent both confusion and controversy.

Comment: This leaves an entirely false impression. On June 5, 1916, Mr. Parks mailed to every member of the Board of Trustees a letter announcing that he was a candidate for reelection to the Board to succeed himself and stating his platform as follows:

"The platform on which I am going to run for the office of trustee, calls for a reorganization of the Board of Trustees, for the abolition of the Summer School, and for the restoration to the faculty of those powers, and the exercise thereof, which rightfully belong to such faculty. If the Board of Trustees as at present constituted fails or refuses to instruct its nominating committee to recommend me for reelection, to the Synod of Ohio, then it will be known that such Board is unalterably opposed to reforms for which I stand. But if the Board of Trustees instructs its nominating committee

to recommend me for reelection as such trustee, and the Synod of Ohio refuses to elect me to such office, then it will be known that the Synod of Ohio is opposed to the reforms for which I stand."

This letter was accompanied by a 16-page document addressed "To the Presbyterian Synod of Ohio and the Board of Trustees of Wooster College of Wooster, Ohio," a copy of which was filed with the moderator of the Synod of Ohio, who acknowledged its receipt on June 14, 1916. The document gives Mr. Parks's views, and the "signed letter" of which the Trustee's report complains is a condensation of it. On September 23, Mr. Parks sent every member of the Board of Trustees a letter setting forth the "grievous wrong" which had been committed in the case of Miss Hughes and notifying them of the petition (the "signed letter") which he was about to file with the clerk of the Synod and mail to various designated persons.

The complaint was "made first to the Board," and the Board replied by refusing to nominate Mr. Parks for reelection.

(14) All that the Board of Trustees, or the administration asks in this connection is a fair chance to carry out their policies, which are also the policies of the Synod, unimpeded by partial, uninformed or malignant criticism.

Comment: Such published criticism as has come to the attention of the Committee of Inquiry has been neither uninformed nor malignant.

(15) The Board is fully determined that the scholarship standards of the College shall not only be maintained but shall be steadily raised, and shall not be allowed to sag at any point.

Comment: The acts of the administration do not support this statement.

(16) The Board of Trustees nominates for reelection to the Board of Trustees, the following members of the Class of 1916, to comprise the Class of 1919: Walter D. Foss, Wooster, Ohio; Rev. David A. Heron, D. D., Wooster, Ohio; Rev. Robert Watson, D. D., New York City; John G. Wishard, M. D., Wooster, Ohio; Philip Wick, Youngstown, Ohio.

Comment: See paragraphs 2 and 8.

(17) The Board of Trustees also recommends that Mr. Alanson L. Palmer be made an honorary trustee.

Comment: This reduces the local representation from ten to nine.

HOW THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE SYNOD WAS CARRIED OUT

It will be remembered that in June, 1916, the Trustees voted that no professor or assistant professor should be dismissed without a previous hearing before a joint committee of trustees and faculty and we have just seen that in October, 1916, the Synod of Ohio recommended that no appointments, promotions, demotions, or dismissals be made without the recommendation of "the same committee." If all appointments and promotions are to be considered by a joint committee it is evident there can be no chance for fair and efficient action unless they are all referred to one and the same permanent, standing committee, and there can be no question that that was what was understood by the Synod committee and by the Synod itself.

On the basis of the action taken by the Trustees in June and of that taken by the Synod in October, the faculty of the College proceeded to elect its five representatives to the joint committee. But we are informed that Dr. White declared that the action of the Trustees, of the Synod committee and of the Synod did not contemplate a standing committee, but rather a set of temporary committees, each of which should deal with one individual case as it arose and then be dissolved. The matter was laid on the table. But, on November 13, it was taken up again and the faculty voted to petition the Board of Trustees to proceed at once to pass the by-laws necessary to give effect to the recommendations of the Synod of Ohio, and to elect their representatives to the proposed committee.

The petition was presented to the Board at a special meeting which happened to come on November 14, and the next day President White wrote to the secretary of the faculty that the petition had been presented, but that, as it was a special meeting, "the Board felt that it could not legally transact any business except that for which it was actually called." At this meeting, however, the Board did actually give an "official interpretation" of the by-law passed in the previous June, to the effect that each case of dismissal is to be dealt with by a special committee. Thus a special meeting of the Board, called for some other purpose, was used to interpret a by-law passed at a regular meeting, to the disadvantage of the faculty and in direct opposition to the known meaning and intention of the Synod.

The following letter from the Rev. Alexander McGaffin contains evidence as to the intention of the Synod's Committee.

EUCLID AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
CLEVELAND, OHIO, November 9, 1916.

I have learned that there has arisen the question of the interpretation of one of the resolutions in the report presented by Synod's committee on Wooster College to the last meeting of the Synod, and adopted there.

It is the resolution having to do with the appointment of committees to deal with the whole matter of the engagement, promotion, and dismissal of members of the teaching staff.

I am perfectly clear in my own mind as to what I understood when the matter was under discussion in committee, and I have no reason to think that the other members of the committee had any different understanding of what was intended. My intention certainly was that the committee recommended in the resolution was to be a standing committee, a permanent committee, renewed in its membership from time to time as might be necessary, but in continual existence and having as its permanent interest all the matters involved in the resolution.

It was my understanding that the Board of Trustees had already ordered, if not organized, such a committee to deal with one phase of the matter, and we recommended to Synod that *all phases* should be put in the care of the same committee. It never once occurred to me that the committee already appointed by the Trustees, and now recommended by us, was to be anything else but a permanent, standing committee.

Yours very sincerely,

ALEXANDER MCGAFFIN.

In regard to the intention of the Synod itself, Dr. Higley writes as follows:

My understanding was that this committee was to be a committee composed of five members from the Board of Trustees, five members elected from the faculty, which was to form a committee to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on all questions concerning the election, promotion, demotion, and dismissal, of teachers. This Judge West stated before the Synod was his understanding, and I on that basis withdrew my objection to the recommendation.

Dr. Higley's statements are confirmed by Rev. Arthur C. Ludlow, one of the permanent clerks of the Synod, who adds, "When Dr. Higley raised the question in Synod, Dr. White sat near him, and listened to Judge West's assurance that what Dr. Higley propounded was the intent of the Committee on Revision." (Judge West was chairman of that committee.) There can be no doubt that the matter was clearly explained in the presence of President White and that he neither objected to the explanations which were given of the Synod committee's resolution or to the interpretation of

the trustee vote which the Synod resolution very obviously assumed.*

We add the faculty petition and the President's reply.

WOOSTER, O., November 13, 1916.

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER,

Gentlemen: Whereas, we the faculty of the College of Wooster did in June, 1916, petition the Board of Trustees for a new plan of effecting appointments, promotions, demotions, and dismissals, whereby the faculty would have a voice in such matters:

And whereas, the Synod of Ohio with the endorsement of the Board of Trustees has recommended a similar system ("In view of the fact that the College of Wooster has so amended its constitution and by-laws as to provide that before a professor, assistant professor, or other teacher shall be removed or discharged, a hearing shall be held before a committee composed of representatives of the faculty and Board of Trustees, that Synod recommends to the College of Wooster that it shall also consider such additional changes in its constitution and by-laws as shall provide that no professor, assistant professor, or teacher be employed, promoted, or demoted without the recommendation of the same committee.")

And whereas, the faculty, basing its belief upon repeated statements in the 46th annual report of the Board of Trustees to the Synod of Ohio, believed that it was the settled policy of the Board of Trustees to make the changes ("The Board of Trustees has already taken official action endorsing all three of the recommendations that have been made by Synod's Special Committee." "Concerning the second recommendation, that members of the faculty be consulted in securing new members of the teaching staff, this is already the fixed policy of the administration. As vacancies occur, the President and Board of Trustees will most cordially welcome all possible help from the faculty and any other interested parties in securing for the College of Wooster the most competent Christian teachers to be found anywhere." Page 12. "Concerning the method of dismissing members of the faculty, the Board has already taken official action in the exact terms suggested by the faculty of the College of Wooster itself, and in complete accord with the most advanced policy proposed by the Association of American University Professors." Page 14), and have been much surprised and disappointed to hear that there is opposition to such a change, and that it may not be brought about;

And whereas, this College is about to inaugurate a financial campaign which will demand the unshaken loyalty of every friend of Wooster, if it is to be carried to success;

Therefore, we the faculty of the College of Wooster do petition that the Board of Trustees, at their meeting to be held during the present month, will proceed at once to pass the proposed by-laws to give effect to the said recommendations of the Synod of Ohio in the exact wording as recommended by the Synod;

And further, That the Board of Trustees will also elect at once the committee to co-operate with the faculty committee in this matter.

*It should be added, however, that President White was not asked for his account of the proceedings at this meeting.

The above petition was moved by Dr. Gould and seconded by Dr. Dunn. It was carried by a vote of fifteen to seven. President White, though the presiding officer, insisted on having his vote registered with the minority. Below are given the names of those who voted, together with their earned degrees. Dean Ruth Marshall and Professor Moffett are serving their first year on the Faculty of Wooster.

Ayes.

LEAN, A.B. (Lawrence).
 KELSO, PH.D. (Leipzig).
 HUNTER, A.B. (Yale)
 YANNEY, A.M. (Mt. Union).
 WOOD, A.M. (Princeton).
 DEAN COMPTON, PH.D. (Wooster).
 GINGRICH.
 MARTIN, A.M. (Princeton).
 VANCE, PH.D. (Jena).
 DUNN, LITT.D. (Glasgow).
 GOULD, PH.D. (Johns Hopkins).
 OLTHOUSE, A.M. (Michigan).
 ROWE, MUS. B. (Univ. of State of N. Y.).
 (Fellow of American Guild of Organists.)
 DEAN RUTH MARSHALL, A.M. (Minnesota).
 MOFFETT, A.M. (Princeton).

Noes.

WHITE, A.M. (Wooster).
 BENNETT, PH.D. (Wooster).
 BEHOTEGUY, A.M. (Parsons)
 PENDLETON, A.M. (Wooster).
 BLACK, A.M. (Kenyon).
 MEYER, A.M. (Harvard).
 KNIGHT, PH.B. (Wooster).
 REMP, A.M. (Nebraska).

PRESIDENT WHITE'S ANSWER TO THE PETITION

WOOSTER, OHIO, November 15, 1916.

PROF. C. P. GOULD,
 Secretary of the Faculty, Wooster, Ohio.

My dear Professor Gould:

The petition of the faculty to the Board of Trustees was presented to the Board at its meeting last night. Inasmuch as this was a special meeting of the Board, and the specific purpose for which it was called had been outlined in the call, the Board felt that it could not legally transact any business except that for which it was actually called. On this account several matters of importance we deferred until a regular meeting of the Board in February—among them, this petition from the faculty. I can assure you that the matter will be given the most careful consideration by the Board at that time.

In order to clarify the action of the Board at its June meeting, the following resolution was passed, and is hereby transmitted to you for the information of the faculty:

"The Board deems it unnecessary and unwise for the faculty to have a standing committee on dismissals, but believes that it is best to deal with each case of that kind through a special committee. This is to be regarded as the official interpretation of the action taken at the June, 1916, meeting of the Board concerning the removal of professors."

It is possible that I was mistaken in my statement to the faculty at the last meeting, as to whether the action taken in June was made a by-law, or whether it was merely passed as a resolution of the Board. My understanding of it was that it was a resolution. Judge West's understanding evidently is that it was a by-law. In either case it is official action by the Board and has all the same effect.

Very sincerely yours,

J. CAMPBELL WHITE,
President.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the foregoing account of the situation at the College of Wooster the committee of inquiry has endeavored to confine itself to questions of fact, and now that the story is told it does not believe that any extended comment upon the facts is necessary. It is obvious that the methods of the present administration have not been such as to appeal to the loyalty of a conscientious and self-respecting faculty, and it is equally obvious that they are not the methods which gain for a college the confidence and respect of the academic world. The committee does not feel called upon to undertake any further characterization of them.

J. E. HAGERTY,
Ohio State University.

WM. H. HOBBS,
University of Michigan.

AMOS S. HERSHEY,
University of Indiana.

A. W. MOORE,
University of Chicago.

H. AUSTIN AIKINS, *Chairman,*
Western Reserve University.

APPENDIX.

1. *President White's Charges.*
2. *Letter from President Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College.*
3. *Letter from Dean Purington, of Mount Holyoke College.*
4. *Letter from President Small, formerly of Mount Holyoke College.*
5. *Letter from Mrs. Butcher, of the Women's Advisory Board.*
6. *Letter from Mrs. Rogers, of the Woman's Advisory Board.*
7. *Letter from Dean Compton.*
8. *Letter from Dean Hughes to Dr. Watson, of the Committee of Conference.*
9. *Letter from Dean Hughes to Mr. Aikins, of the Committee of Inquiry.*
10. *Letter to Miss Hughes from Professor Henderson (Trustee).*
11. *Letter from Faculty Members to the Trustees after the Establishment of the Two-Year Normal Course.*
12. *Dean Compton's Letter of Resignation from the Joint Committee.*
13. *Petition from New York and other Alumni.*

I.

THE CHARGES AGAINST MISS HUGHES, AS CONTAINED IN A DOCUMENT GIVEN TO THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY BY PRESIDENT WHITE ON MAY 31, 1916.

The chief reasons why Miss Hughes is not satisfactory as Dean of Women of the College of Wooster are the following:

1. She is much too nervous. Her nervousness affects many people and makes them uncomfortable in her presence. It affects her conversation so much that she has difficulty in making a clear concise statement of any situation but is constantly diverted into all sorts of side issues. The same characteristic affects her teaching to a marked degree.

2. She lacks poise and force,—qualities that are essential in a Dean of Women of high order.

3. She does not understand how to get the best out of young women. She fails to attach them to her by any strong bond. She creates no enthusiasm among the girls for her own personality. It is doubtful if any girl in College would think of trying to be like her. Though they naturally and properly hesitate to express themselves frankly about her, most of the girls regard her as unfitted for her position. When a petition was started among them to ask for her retention, after it was known that her services were to be discontinued, it was signed by less than half a dozen girls. The most influential women in College said so positively that she was not suited to the place, that the petition was dropped. Wide inquiry among women who have graduated since Miss Hughes has been Dean has revealed the fact that practically all of them regard her as unfitted for the position.

4. A Visiting Committee of the Board of Trustees in February, 1915, received so many complaints about Miss Hughes that they were on the point of recommending then that her services be discontinued, but decided finally to let the matter wait

for later action. But they knew that the situation was highly unsatisfactory, and could not long be allowed to continue.

5. Miss Hughes makes the fatal mistake in dealing with girls of attempting to control by criticism and repression instead of by encouragement and inspiration. In this way she has discouraged many girls from trying to do their best.

6. In general, the personal limitations of Miss Hughes are too great to be ignored in a Dean of Women in a college that aims at the highest attainable standard of efficiency. There is no more important or difficult position to fill in connection with the College than the position of Dean of Women. Her influence may be very powerful not only over the women of the College but also, over the men. The administration at Wooster is not satisfied with mediocre standards of efficiency. It claims the right as it has the duty of doing its best for the future generations of students, who may come here for their education.

7. The only reasons why action in Miss Hughes' case was taken by the Executive Committee instead of waiting to have action taken by the entire Board, were out of genuine consideration for Miss Hughes herself. (1) That unnecessary publicity might be avoided, and she be allowed to withdraw quietly without having her limitations discussed. (2) That she be given as long notice as possible of her discontinuance. (3) That the notice might not be given her while at her work but during the vacation period.

8. The appreciation expressed by the Executive Committee in its letter to Miss Hughes was perfectly genuine, but it said nothing whatever about her success as a Dean of Women. The reason given in that letter for discontinuing Miss Hughes' services was also perfectly genuine, though by no means the only reasons in the mind of the committee. It was not thought necessary or appropriate to point out all of her weaknesses, in telling her that her services would not be required after the present college year.

The administration would have greatly preferred not to be compelled to analyze or describe the limitations of Miss Hughes that make her unsatisfactory as a Dean of Women. The committee of five members of the Board of Trustees on February 2, 1916, besought Miss Hughes for her own sake, to retire quietly and not attempt to stir up as much trouble as she could in leaving. She clearly indicated at that time that she was seriously considering an appeal to the American Professors Association for an investigation. Now that such an appeal has been made, and an investigation has been ordered, the College is under the necessity, painful though it is, of indicating frankly, though with much reserve, its judgment of the unsuitability of Miss Hughes as a Dean of Women.

The College submits as corroborative of the above statements, letters from various members of the Faculty, Women's Advisory Board, Trustees, Alumni, students, parents of students, and others who have been thrown into such close contact with Miss Hughes as to be in a position to form a fair judgment of her fitness to occupy the position of Dean of Women. These letters have all been given with the promise by the College that they are to be regarded as confidential and are to be given no publicity beyond the Committee of Investigation itself. Professor Aikins, the Chairman of the Investigating Committee, has given me assurance that they will be so treated.

[Inasmuch as parts of this document have not been discussed in the body of the report it would not be fair to Miss Hughes to publish it altogether without com-

ment. In the first place, President White is the only member of the Executive Committee interviewed by Mr. Aikins who found any fault with Dean Hughes' teaching, and two members testified that they knew of nothing in the nervousness from which they said she suffered to interfere with her success as a college or high school teacher. The Committee of Inquiry has made no especial effort to inform itself concerning student opinion; but there is much to indicate that the statements in the first half of paragraph 3 are altogether too sweeping. These statements do represent the attitude of certain student leaders with whom President White was in touch, but these leaders themselves do not appear to have been fairly representative of their fellow-students. The committee does not know the history of the student petition. None of the correspondence submitted and none of the evidence except President White's makes any reference to inquiries about Dean Hughes amongst the alumnae previous to President White's circular letter asking for evidence against her. There is very little in President White's evidence against Miss Hughes to support the charge made in paragraph 5. The confidential letters against Miss Hughes cannot, of course, be published, and inasmuch as the Committee of Inquiry has not attempted to settle the question of her merits as a Dean of Women there is no reason why they should be. The same consideration applies to letters in her favor from members of the faculty and other persons of standing in the community.

President White's charges were not made until long after Dean Hughes' dismissal by the Executive Committee, and the final action of the full Board does not seem to have been based in any way upon them.]

II.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE,
SOUTH HADLEY, MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 9, 1916.
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

REVEREND ADELBERT P. HIGLEY,
The Calvary Presbyterian Church,
Corner Euclid Avenue and 79th Street,
Cleveland, Ohio.

My dear Doctor Higley:

Miss Winona Hughes, Dean of the College of Wooster, asks me to write you my impressions of her when she was at Mount Holyoke, a service which I am very glad to give.

Miss Hughes was here several years as instructor in the Department of Chemistry and for a time the administrative head of one of our residence halls. I had a very sincere respect for her good judgment, her devotion to the welfare of the students and her wisdom in dealing with them. The choice of her as Dean of Wooster seemed to me an excellent one in regard both to character and executive ability. I can speak of her only in the highest terms and am very glad to write you the impression which she made upon me. She had a large circle of friends at Mount Holyoke and I am sure that my estimate would be warmly seconded.

Believe me

Very sincerely yours,

[Signed] MARY E. WOOLLEY.

III.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE,
June 9, 1916.

REVEREND ADELBERT P. HIGLEY,
The Calvary Presbyterian Church,
Corner Euclid Avenue and Seventy-ninth Street,
Cleveland, Ohio.

My dear Sir:

Miss Winona A. Hughes, Dean of Women at the College of Wooster, has asked me to write you regarding my impression of her character and work as I knew her at Mount Holyoke College. This I am very glad to do. As instructor in the Department of Chemistry, we found her an able and conscientious worker. As social head of Porter Hall, one of our large residence halls, she showed herself to be a woman of high ideals, tact, common sense, and earnest Christian character. Her influence upon the students was sane and helpful and she won the respect and esteem of both students and faculty. I do not know enough of the controversy at Wooster to desire to take any part in it, and of course I know nothing, except in a general way, of Miss Hughes' qualifications for the post which she now holds. I am, however, very happy to give this tribute to her ability as a teacher and official and to her excellent character as shown in the years spent at Mount Holyoke.

Sincerely yours,

[Signed] FLORENCE PURINGTON,
Dean.

IV.

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE,
PAINESVILLE, OHIO, June 10, 1916.
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

My dear Dr. Higley:

Ever since the unfortunate controversy regarding the work of Miss Winona Hughes at the College of Wooster arose I have been eager to do or say something that might be of service to her. Now I learn that a letter to you would at least not be regarded as an intrusion and might help Miss Hughes.

Miss Hughes and I were colleagues in the faculty of Mount Holyoke College for a period of three years. I knew her not only personally, but in her official capacity as social head of one of the halls of residence and through the head of her department who was an intimate friend of mine, I was considerably in touch with Miss Hughes' relation to the colleagues with whom she was most closely associated.

In none of these relations did I ever know of any adverse criticisms. Miss Hughes was regarded by all, students and faculty, as a very superior woman in character and ability. Her dignity and poise, her earnestness of purpose, her thorough and very kindly interest in her students, her absolute loyalty to the administration of both her department and the college—all combined to make her one whom we of other departments regarded as a woman whom Mount Holyoke was fortunate to have on its staff.

Naturally I have no opinion regarding the merits of the case that has developed at the College of Wooster but I am glad to place before some one in authority

my testimony as to the standing of Miss Hughes in the college with which she was connected before going to Wooster.

I trust that you will receive this communication in the spirit in which it is offered.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signed] VIVIAN B. SMALL.

DR. ADELBERT P. HIGLEY,

In care of The Calvary Presbyterian Church,
Euclid Avenue & 79th St.
Cleveland, Ohio.

V.

January 21, 1916.

DEAN ELIAS COMPTON,
Wooster, Ohio.

My dear Mr. Compton:

I was shocked and amazed to hear this morning that in the strife and contention in Wooster over Dean Hughes that I, as president of the Advisory Board am the one most opposed to her on that board.

Surely there is much being said that has no foundation.

In defense of myself and the Women's Advisory Board, we are ignorant of the causes that have brought this trouble about. You are probably aware that there is not perfect agreement among the Executive Committee—but Dean Hughes has her friends in that committee.

As president of the Advisory Board, I have listened to all that has been offered—but have kept my own counsel. If you will note carefully the wording of Dr. Hills' letter to Dean Hughes expressing their appreciation of the work she has done and why they asked for her resignation, will you tell me in what way we as an Advisory Board are responsible?

I am very confident you will agree with me, when I say, Dean Hughes has had no easy sailing at Wooster. Conditions have not been such that it could be easy for any one in that position. We know of some of the difficulties that Dean Hughes has had to contend with—many of which have been overcome—until the change to me at this present time is truly marvelous.

During my recent visit at Wooster, I was not only pleased, but deeply impressed with the perfect harmony, the love and devotion between the Dean and the young women.

I do not know of a greater evidence of esteem held by the young women students than the great package of Christmas remembrances which came to her during the last holiday.

The girls are happy, good work is being accomplished, the halls are being made more attractive, the government is ideal—all by the continued energy and hard work of the Dean. May I ask how comes all this dissatisfaction? I want to say to you now, I stand for Dean Hughes.

I am writing you confidentially. I have no thought or desire to enter into their controversy—but I do want you to know where I stand.

Very sincerely,

[Signed] MARIETTA S. BUTCHER.

VI.

Dear Miss Hughes:

I have never heard your name mentioned in a meeting of the Advisory Board except when your coming was discussed and all were enthusiastic for it. I have never heard you criticized by a member of that board or received any communication containing a hint of such criticism from such persons. I was told two weeks ago by a Bowling Green mother that her daughter's admiration for you had steadily increased as she knew you better. I certainly think you have rare qualifications for such a position as you hold. I will write again soon but this must get off at once.

Most lovingly,

[Signed] M. H. ROGERS.*

Bowling Green, May 23, 1916.

VII.

WOOSTER, Ohio, April 8, 1916.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

As a member of the faculty of the College of Wooster for thirty-five years and as dean for seventeen years, I have had opportunity to know intimately the conditions and needs of the College in relation to the care and discipline of the young women. In a petition presented in January, 1916, by twenty-four members of the College teaching staff for a reconsideration by the trustees of their recent action in relation to Miss Winona A. Hughes, Dean of Women, I expressed my estimate of the value and success of her services as Dean.

I desire to say now that in the light of the discussions that have followed, my estimate of Dean Hughes is confirmed and my appreciation of her work deepened. Her record will bear the closest scrutiny. I wish it to be known that I stand for Dean Hughes and believe profoundly that she ought to be reinstated.†

Respectfully yours,

[Signed] ELIAS COMPTON.

VIII.

HOLDEN HALL, February 15, 1916.

My Dear Dr. Watson:

You are doubtless looking for a letter from me, but I fear that what I write will not be what you most desire.

I have followed your exhortation and I have been thinking things out for myself.

You say, "In their judgment you ought to go, there is incompatibility, as in a divorce case, both admirable people, but they cannot get along together." The question has come to my mind again and again—Incompatibility with whom? Certainly it is not with the faculty. How could it be with the President-elect of the College when I have seen almost nothing of him this year since he assumed

* Mrs. Rogers is dead. The letter is published with the consent of her husband.

† This letter from Dean Compton is published without the knowledge or consent of the writer.

the office? Is the incompatibility with the local trustees? I never see them except Dr. Wishard when he comes to the house on a very rare professional call, or when I see him to help plan some work . . . can do. . . . Almost the only other one I see is Pastor Weir, and I have seen him only the times when I have entertained him and his family and his guests at dinner.

Is it incompatibility with the students? I did not know until after our talks when you were here that one of the charges brought up against me was the statement that students do as I want them to just because they must and not because they want to, there is no sympathy only armed truce. Almost thirteen years I have lived in college halls. I know the spirit of college girls. Why if there be this spirit did the most prominent girl in college come to me the night after the first statement was in the paper, before the Trustee meeting, and say, "What can we do? The girls are upstairs wringing their hands and saying they must do something." I said, "No, you can do nothing." . . .

You assured me if I would make a sacrifice it would not be in vain. You said you were sure the University of Pennsylvania plan of appointment and dismissal would be adopted. I said there would be some way the minority would get around it. You were shocked and said there could be no injustice in the plan, the members were elected. Even then as we talked, the worst injustice that could be offered to a faculty had been voted through by the trustees. The faculty is reorganized. At least six of the faculty members have been disfranchised. The Dean of Women is one of them. She was a regular voting member of the faculty in a college with a much higher standard than the one which has just now taken away her vote. She was given full membership and voting power by the President of the College when she assumed the duties of her present office. Another who has been disfranchised has his Ph.D. *summa cum laude* from Johns Hopkins. Others who are educationally unfit and untrained by all decent academic standards are made associate professors and given full faculty vote. Two members of the academy faculty of course keep their votes. *Pro* Dickason, *pro* normal school, *pro* White mean academic advancement. Any effort one may make for high academic standards or justice means humiliation, disfranchisement, dismissal. . . .

The most deplorable, and the utterly discouraging thing about our situation at Wooster is the fact that peace is the only idea of trustees whom we would expect to be thinking men. Justice, or a real seeking for truth? No! Peace. "We may lose Phi Beta Kappa if we are not quiet." Who wants Phi Beta Kappa if it be not honestly ours! "Be a martyr, one of the long line of Christian martyrs." A martyr for what? For truth, for justice, for righteousness, for the honor and for the dignity of the College? No, be a martyr to save the College from the disgrace of publicity of its deeds of darkness. Incompatibility, yes there is incompatibility with falsehood, with low academic ideals, with malicious misrepresentations.

For five years at Wooster there is no sacrifice that I have not gladly made. Never once in all that time has personal preference or pleasure been put before any college call of duty or anything that would give pleasure to any student. I've sacrificed all personal ambitions, the one ambition has been to bring the lives of our students to the point of honesty and justice and the living of lives that tallied with their praying lives. I've sacrificed financial gain, and almost my

health at one time. I am willing to sacrifice for anything that is worth while. Why may I ask, shall I be asked to be a martyr to protect one who, by his hypnotic power, influences otherwise fair-minded, just men to follow the line of expediency rather than that of truth and justice? . . .

Most sincerely yours,

[Signed] WINONA A. HUGHES.

IX.

AN ANSWER TO THE CHARGES OF MR. J. CAMPBELL WHITE

HOLDEN HALL, WOOSTER, OHIO,

June 29, 1916.

Prof. H. AUSTIN AIKINS,
Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio.

My dear Professor Aikins:

Your copy of the charges of President J. Campbell White against me possibly merit a reply. When I first read them I was aghast and amazed at the statements which seemed so utterly at variance with the facts as I knew them.

In the first place, Mr. White had no first hand knowledge of me or my work. Except when he was a dinner guest at my home in Marion last summer he had never talked with me more than a few minutes at a time on three or four occasions.

The first statement: "She is much too nervous," and the following remarks:

On the morning of February 2, 1916, I spent three hours with a committee of five Trustees of the College; Mr. White was one of the number. I had no notes, and I had made no preparation but I think neither Mr. White nor any other member of that committee had any difficulty in understanding anything I had to say that morning. If ever one were nervous or distraught, I think that occasion was sufficient to make such a state manifest itself. When I reported that meeting to some of my faculty friends afterward, they remarked that they judged that I had made myself perfectly understood. One member of that committee said that my meeting with those five men for those hours had effectually disproved the charge of "nervousness" which had been made against me.

From various sources, I have heard for about three years, that Dr. Wishard considers me very nervous. It has seemed to me that the personal equation enters fairly largely into some of these statements.

[Here follows the recital of a certain incident, the publication of which would cause unnecessary embarrassment in certain quarters.]

I can pick out at least six students who chance to come to my mind just as I write, who were very nervous, delicate girls, and their coming to college was an experiment. They, or their mothers, or both, have told me that my influence and guidance and care have helped these girls so much that they have been able to stay in school, have grown strong and well, and their well-being is due entirely to me. These girls have frequently come to my sitting-room in the evening, I have sent them to bed, or helped them with their work, or sent them for a walk, or they have simply sat in my room and read or rested while I worked. More than once,

the most nervous girl I have ever known has just sat quietly in my room for an hour, and then said, "I feel better now, I can go to sleep."

As nearly as I can find out, the students most seriously affected by my great nervousness are the ones who failed to pay their bills, who shrieked in the halls, who were public disturbers of the peace, and who failed to recognize the rights of others. I could give many facts to substantiate the last general statements, but I will refrain.

The attack on my teaching has seemed to me to be particularly unfair and unjust.* In the spring of 1913, my first year here, I discussed the question of some Art courses with Dean Compton. Together we went to the President to present the matter; almost at once when I began to talk President Holden said it was no use, if we wanted a man here to do that work we might as well not talk about it, as there was no money. I retorted that we did not want a man, we wanted a woman, and he would have to listen to me. With a characteristic chuckle he said he would listen. When I had finished, President Holden turned to me and said, "Will you do that work?" I said, "No, I want one of the younger teachers either from Mount Holyoke or Wellesley." I went on to say that I had no adequate preparation to give such work. Dean Compton went over to Dr. Holden's side and said he thought I could give some courses of this sort very acceptably. It finally ended in the work not being given or my taking it up. I agreed to do the work and the matter was arranged with the Trustees.

During the five years I was at Mount Holyoke, I had gone into most of the Art courses given there; and five years ago this summer I spent four glorious months of the hardest kind of study in Europe with Miss Louise R. Jewett, Head of the Art Department at Mount Holyoke. When I knew I was to do this work at Wooster, I immediately arranged with Miss Jewett to spend a month with her at Mount Holyoke that summer. We worked in the Art Library, I using her outlines and plans, getting the lists of books and pictures, and photo mounts, and all the hundred details necessary. Finally as we got pretty tired, we took a trunk full of books and went up to the Mountain House for a week. The middle of the last afternoon I was there, we finished the last book of the work we had planned. Even before I came home that summer, I ordered a good many hundreds of books and pictures for the work. President Holden had given me permission to do so. All that fall Miss Jewett sent me cathedral plans, pictures, sketches, and helps of every sort, anything she thought would help and interest me. She continued this until her tragic death in January.

We have acquired for the College Library I think about a thousand art books. I have had the books in the Art Room as we needed them by subjects. I have never assigned a definite number of pages in a book for the students to learn. I have had everything carefully outlined, and usually the bibliography posted for the students. Occasionally I have had them make their own bibliography. I have worked out devices by which good plans and diagrams have been furnished to each student. Frequently I have had as many as twenty-five books from which they could get their material for the day. I gave the definite subject and it was for them to work it out. Each student had several hundred of the small prints of the Bureau of University Travel. They made their notes from day to day and

*President White is the only member of the executive committee who made any criticism of Miss Hughes' teaching.

filled the prints with the notes. These I examined carefully from week to week, and very frequently I gave a ten minute written lesson in class. Many times I have left class utterly discouraged because I felt that my recitation had been a failure, but it was always with the grim determination that I would do better the next time. No one knows so well as I, how far short my work has fallen below my ideals. I do know I have had results. The students have learned to know books and how to use them; they have learned to think, and to plan, and to classify, and to work as many of them have never worked before. Until just now, the only criticism of my work I have ever heard, was that it required so much time. I always said two hours were enough for a lesson, the students said they knew it, but they always felt they had to do so much more. This spring vacation the one freshman in the class took home an arm full of books and spent hours doing extra work, just because she wanted to do it. Students who have been out teaching tell me that nothing has helped them so much in teaching history or literature as this art work. Two students who finished this work last year have come into the art room this year and spent hours adding to the notes and drawings of last year, and coloring their prints. They always wanted any new diagrams I had. After the notes and papers and examination books were all in, four of the students wanted the books left in the art room that they might work during commencement week. Two of them left after a couple of days, but two of them worked even on Friday after commencement day. One of these students has borrowed material from me to finish this summer. Whatever else may be said about my teaching in the "History of Architecture" and the "History of Italian Painting," I have had the joy of seeing students develop into earnest workers and real seekers after knowledge.

"She lacks poise and force." Perhaps I do not know the meaning of these terms. I should suppose that any one who had been publicly discredited last February by the highest authorities in the College, and then, could in the face of all that, meet every academic and social obligation had at least some poise.

In the autumn of 1914 the house cleaning at Holden Hall seemed to fall by the way, between the departure of a very inefficient housekeeper and the coming of a new matron. The walls had been mended but they were certainly grimy and mottled. The floors in the parlors and reception halls had many coats of varnish mixed with the dirt ground in. I asked Dr. Holden something about the floors, and he told me I was running those halls. Results and not details were what he wanted. I had just two weeks before college opened. At the end of that time everything that could be washed had been sent to the laundry; the walls all over the whole house were fresh and clean with at least two coats of paint. The painters could not clean the floors so I had the women do it with lye; the old varnish was removed and the beautifully waxed and polished floors have been a great satisfaction ever since. There was not a spot in the house that was not clean and in order when College opened. With the most efficient matron, Miss Hatch, it has been kept so ever since. While I was looking after anywhere from seven to fifteen working people a day to do this, at night I was getting copy ready for the printer. Dean Compton was in Europe and I had all the official printing to look after before College opened.

The two beautiful oriental rugs in the reception hall in Holden Hall cost the College less than domestic rugs that would have been shabby within a year.

Several trips to Cleveland and much planning were required before they were ours. The College has never bought any furnishings for the halls since I have been here. Two years ago we got one set of beautiful bookcases which are filled with choice books. The week before College closed this June, I took to the Treasurer's office a bill for \$100 for some bookcases that fill the whole end of the room. I also carried with me a hundred dollars in bills to pay for these bookcases. Dr. Holden had secured the money for books from Mr. Solon Severance.

The gymnasium work for girls, the girls' field for hockey and other out-of-door games, the extra tennis court, the tulip bed with nearly 1,500 bulbs, the quantities of flowers everywhere, from some dozens of peonies to bushels of dahlia roots, these things have not just happened, or come by chance. I think probably Mr. McLaughlin and possibly Dean Compton can tell you that I have been pretty much responsible for getting these things for the students.

I had over 4,000 photographs sent over from London on approval. From these I chose over 2,500. We have 2,416 photographs mounted and carefully classified, with 334 still unmounted. I secured various sums of money to help buy these photographs.

The scheme for choosing rooms, whereby seniors by lot have the first choice, the juniors next, the sophomores last, was worked out only after the most harrowing experiences. Every one now agrees it is the only fair way to choose rooms. Possibly what I have given above will show some of the reasons why I think the charge of lack of force is unjustified.

I have considerable information about the petition that was started and blocked. It makes rather interesting reading. I know enough to convince me of as false and underhand work as one could imagine but I have not all the facts, therefore I can make no definite statements.

The visiting committee of the Board of Trustees in 1915 in February consisted of the Rev. Dr. Watson,* who was not present, Mr. J. Campbell White, and the Rev. E. M. McMillin of Mansfield. I did not speak to Mr. White at all I think, and Mr. McMillin stopped only a moment to talk to me; he was in too much of a hurry to talk of my work or to be even ordinarily polite to me. The visit of these two men was just two weeks after my serious difficulty with the now well known [X case]. When I had my three-hour interview with the Trustees of the College of Wooster on June 13, 1916, it was brought out there by Dr. Wishard that I could not get along with the faculty, and that I had at one time told Mrs. Crawford, housemother at Hoover Cottage, that she was meddlesome. That remark of Dr. Wishard and several others of a similar character that day at the meeting of the Trustees made clear to me many things I had not been able to fathom before. In investigating the case of Miss X I went to Mrs. Crawford for information. She refused to tell me anything, saying when the time came I would know. I said that the most terrible things that could be said against any one were being said about this girl and they were false. I was decidedly emphatic in my denunciations of the gossips who were ruining this girl. Mrs. Crawford went off into weeping and said that Dr. Weir knew all she knew and I could ask him. It then developed that Mrs. Crawford herself was one of the ones who had been investigating this matter and stirring up this gossip. She had sent for Miss X and had warned her and wept over her. She had sent for ———, and had also inter-

*Various trustees mention Dr. Heron (not Dr. Watson).

viewed a number of other students on the subject. It was then that I told Mrs. Crawford, who has only the social and domestic cares of the Freshman House, that she and Dr. Weir were assuming the responsibilities belonging to Dean Compton and to me. None of these students were even freshmen. It was one of the most uncomfortable interviews I ever had, and I discussed the whole situation with Dean Compton the next day to see wherein I had been in the wrong. The criticisms he made were not against me. Mr. White did not see me when he was on the visiting committee, but he was with Dr. Weir almost constantly, and from him and from Mrs. Crawford the criticisms of me came. When Mr. White was here at the May, 1915, Trustees' meeting he criticized me very severely, comparing me to Mrs. Crawford, saying that she was the great religious leader, that she was so capable and so motherly with the girls; everything that could be said in her praise he said, while I was entirely lacking in all those qualities. These criticisms were made to Dean Compton who gave Mr. White enough facts to convince anyone it would seem that I was capable of keeping my head and attending to college affairs. Dean Compton and I both thought the matter ended there. I knew of the incident from Dean Compton, but I did not know until much later who the criticizing trustee was. I maintain that President White formed his estimate of my work and usefulness on second-hand information, and this from one who is scarcely fitted to decide on faculty rating. A whole series of criticisms, reiterating phrases and the like have been coming out persistently, for six months. I was utterly in the dark and could not understand where they came from. After that Trustees' meeting, the whole thing was perfectly clear, the last piece of the picture fell into place. Since then, I have traced much of the malicious gossip directly to Mrs. Crawford, who is very intimate with the Weirs, the Wishards, Mrs. Platter of the Advisory Board, and others. Even people who have talked to me and to my friends about the wonderful changes that I have been able to bring about here, have turned, this year, and have talked of my utter lack of ability as Dean of Women. Three years of great success followed by one year of utter failure, seemed strange to me until I thought of their boarding much of the time at Hoover Cottage, when they were not ill and under the care of Dr. Wishard. Every year since I have been here I have had to straighten out serious cases of discipline at Hoover Cottage. Often Mrs. Crawford herself asked me to do so, and more than once, girls have come to me to make serious complaints. I have always consulted Mrs. Crawford and our relations I thought were friendly. Whatever was done, so far as I was concerned, was a part of the day's work and ended there. I knew she never approved of my way of doing things, she wanted strict boarding-school rules which I was unwilling to make. I knew Mrs. Crawford occasionally voiced some disapproval of me, but its very serious character was a great surprise to me when it was made plain at the Trustees' meeting.

The committee of five members of the Board of Trustees on February 2, 1916, besought me to retire quietly, not for my own sake, but for the sake of the College. Dr. Hudnut said, granted that the Executive Committee has blundered, has blundered egregiously, for the sake of the College go quietly. We have been so torn up here this year, that a college no more than a plant can be continually uprooted. "I beg of you," he said, "for the sake of the College, go quietly." I replied that if I allowed any publicity it was because I was willing to make that greater sacrifice for the College. I made Dr. Hudnut acknowledge that he be-

lieved me that it would be a greater sacrifice to have publicity. I was asked to be a martyr, to be one of the long line of Christian martyrs for the sake of the College. One man said that a Dean at ——— University, who made public his affairs was living on his farm this year. I assured the gentleman that I saw nothing ahead for me but the farm.

"Attempts to control by criticism instead of by encouragement."

I will give a few typical illustrations which I think show the opposite. A freshman girl came to college two years ago for a good time; unfortunately not an isolated case. I felt she had in her the making of a real woman. She would not study more than enough to get through. She went down the fire-escape instead of the stairs one morning and hurt herself severely. She told me a story about it, which I accepted, although I knew she was not telling the truth. Two days later, I had a most penitent note confessing her falsehood. Last summer, this girl wrote to me that she could not come back to college unless she had a scholarship. The College could give her none at that time, but I told her to come, I would arrange in some way for her tuition. Until Thanksgiving time she was spasmodically studious and well behaved. About that time she settled down to work and did very well for the remainder of the term. A few days before the Christmas vacation, I wrote to a Pittsburgh lady and asked her if she would care to meet the tuition expenses of this young lady. I told the exact truth about the girl. The return mail brought a check for \$70, the balance I had to raise. I called the girl in at once and told her that I had the checks for her tuition. I also told her that I had not written for the money until she had shown some signs of real earnestness. I told her too, that if she had not settled down to study I would not have asked any one for the money, but would have paid it myself, and she never would have known it. I have had no trouble whatever, with the girl since. She can be depended on in every way.

A girl came here from another college this year. She did a dishonorable thing, but I did not know of it. She came to me in great distress of mind one day and said I never would forgive her for what she had done for I had such high ideals for the girls. She told me her trouble, I arranged for her to see the other person involved, and the gratitude of the girl and her new sense of honor were very gratifying.

A week before college closed a girl came to my sitting-room on some errand and as she was leaving she flushed and said: "I want you to know I am with you, Miss Hughes." She further said that they had been discussing things in a large group of girls and they were all agreed that "Miss Hughes is just, she is kind, she is reasonable."* I could multiply instances. I am enclosing a few letters that chanced to escape the waste basket. I have appreciated the dozens of kindly grateful letters I have received but I took them for granted and never dreamed of ever needing them as evidence.

My whole soul revolts against bringing to the knowledge of others illustrations of things that were part of our daily life. I have given myself absolutely, soul and strength to the work here; there was joy and satisfaction in it. I loved it. I cared for it as I have never cared for any other work I have ever done. There has been the joy of achievement, of seeing results. I think had people

*This statement agrees exactly with one made to the committee through an entirely different channel of which Miss Hughes knows nothing. It is undoubtedly true.

known the facts, had they made any effort to know them, there would not have been this criticism.

The first week I was in Wooster, one evening I saw two young men waiting impatiently in the drawing room. As I had known one of the young men since his childhood days we chatted a few minutes, and then I found they had been kept waiting. I said, "Did you send up your cards?" One of them at once produced a very grimy card and the other said, "Oh, we do not use cards here." I said I would see at once that the young ladies were called. Two days later it was announced in the town paper that the new Dean of Women demanded cards of all young men who called and that they must first be inspected by her and passed before the young men would be allowed to see the young women. I was told on pretty good authority that many orders for cards went in.

I am sorry to leave Wooster. I have given the College my best. I am discredited by the highest authorities here. My vindication or not in the academic world rests with you. I want only justice and truth.

Very sincerely,

[Signed] WINONA A. HUGHES.

X.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
COLUMBUS, June 26, 1916.

MISS WINONA HUGHES,
Holden Hall,
Wooster, Ohio.

My dear Miss Hughes:

Ever since my return from Wooster I have had it in mind to write to you, but have been prevented up to this time by pressure of work. I am unwilling to have the recent action of the Board of Trustees at Wooster pass, without giving you my point of view both as a trustee and as an old friend. Although you have not asked for any statement from me, it is my wish to present to you as clearly as I can the situation as it appeared to me.

In the first place the executive committee of the Board undoubtedly acted within its rights, as defined by the rules of the Board, in notifying you that it had plans for the future that would require specialized training on the part of the one acting as Dean of Women, and that as a consequence your services would not be required after July 1. In common with many other members of the Board, I feel that it was very ill-advised to exercise this power, partly because of the gravity of the step, partly because a local committee is apt to be unduly moved by local prejudices (though quite unconsciously), but largely because, having once taken this step, a reversal by the Board becomes a very difficult matter. The fact that the Board has taken from the executive committee the right of removal indicated the conviction of the Board that such action is inexpedient.

In the second place I feel that if there was dissatisfaction with your work on the part of the committee, the committee owed it to you to acquaint you with this fact before it took action. You would then have had a natural opportunity of bringing before them the difficulties under which you have worked and the great

improvements you have effected. You might easily have accounted for some of the criticisms that had reached the committee.

In the third place I felt that the definite solicitation of testimony disadvantageous to you, and after the committee had acted, was unfair to you. It advertised widely the attitude of the committee, and tended to crystallize into fixed opinion in the minds of many who received these inquiries what may have been mild questioning up to that time. All of this created sentiment against you and gave publicity to the case. There were no definite charges and all that was asked for was opinion as to your success.

When the matter came up to the Board for review, and after listening to your own defense as well as to the point of view of the President and the executive committee, I became convinced that an overruling of the committee was impracticable. The matter had gone so far before the College public, the administration was so strongly committed to the support of the action of the committee and so many people in and around Wooster had given written expression of their opinions, that your usefulness and influence at Wooster had been too seriously impaired to make it possible for you to continue there. You might have felt a certain satisfaction in vindication by the Board or by a substantial minority of it, but your future work would have been unpleasant and unsatisfactory, and the outcome would have been painful to you and disorganizing to the work at Wooster. . . .

In view of what I have said you will see that my vote was not upon the merits of the case, on which I would not yet feel competent to pass judgment, but was to my mind necessitated by the situation that had been created. While it may not be of any great consolation to you, it is a matter of much satisfaction to me to know that we shall not have such a case again, but will be able to deal squarely with the merits of the case.

I greatly regret that one who has worked so loyally and unceasingly for the welfare of the girls at Wooster should give up that work with hurt and in sorrow. The thought that I may have added to this feeling is so distressing to me that it has prompted this effort to try to explain my motives, and remove my action from the realm of personal judgment to that of circumstantial necessity. May I assure you that it will be my hope that a more happy and peaceful opportunity may open before you, and that any assistance within my power will be willingly rendered?

Very sincerely,

[Signed] W. E. HENDERSON.

XI.

LETTER SENT TO THE TRUSTEES WHEN THE NORMAL SCHOOL POLICY WAS ADOPTED
WOOSTER, OHIO, February 5, 1916.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER,

Brethren: Having done all we could in honor do to avert the action which you have taken in relation to the two-year normal course, we deem it proper to say that nothing has occurred in the history of the College, so far as we know it, that is so disheartening to the faculty as is that action, because we believe that, under all the circumstances, the action involves among other grave consequences,

(1) A blurring of the aim and ideal of the College for which we are laboring,

(2) The disturbance of the relation of mutual confidence between the Board and the Faculty,

(3) An increased difficulty in securing the services of first-class college teachers and executives,

(4) A lowering of the efficiency of the College,

(5) A depreciation of the value of its diplomas both past and future.

Yours sincerely,

ELIAS COMPTON.

H. G. BEHOTEGUY.

B. F. YANNEY.

JOHN B. KELSO.

CHALMERS MARTIN.

J. MILTON VANCE.

H. N. MATEER.

S. MORRIS.

W. E. CHANCELLOR.

H. C. GRUMBINE.

WINONA A. HUGHES.

H. WILHELM TAEUSCH.

H. T. ARCHIBALD.

GERTRUDE GINGRICH.

CLARENCE P. GOULD.

A. J. MILLER.

R. H. HUNTER.

DELBERT G. LEAN.

R. P. THOMAS.

J. W. OLTHOUSE.

E. A. BAUER.

BERENICE F. WIKOFF.

WALTER E. PECK.

N. O. ROWE.

C. C. VAN VOORHIS.

H. C. THORPE.

E. B. RIGGS.

ORA M. REDETT.

(Members of the Teaching Staff of the Collegiate Department.)

XII.

WOOSTER, OHIO, March 1, 1916.

THE TRUSTEES OF THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER,

Dear Brethren: At your meeting on February 2, you appointed a joint committee of trustees and faculty to have in charge the Summer School and the new elementary Normal School. Though my name was placed on that committee and published without my knowledge or consent, and though it was with the greatest reluctance I began service on the committee, I took up the task. But later developments have brought the conviction that I should resign my position on the committee, and state to you, who appointed me, the facts that have led to this conclusion. The following is the best account I am able to give.

The joint committee of Trustees and Faculty, appointed by the trustees to have charge of the Summer School and the Normal Course met on Saturday, February 6, at 8:15 a. m., at the Dean's office.

The action of the trustees in which the committee was created was read, as follows:

DEAN ELIAS COMPTON, PH. D.

Wooster, Ohio.

My dear Sir:

It becomes my duty, as secretary of the Board of Trustees, to give you official notice of the following action by the Board:

1. *Resolved* That the proposed two-year Normal Course be adopted.

2. *Be it RESOLVED* that this department be organized on a basis separate from the College proper; that its committee of control be responsible for its work, pass upon the merit of the credits to be given, and certify to the state superintendent the work done.

3. In order to bring about a closer relation between the Summer School and the College of Wooster, *Be it Resolved* that the committee, consisting of Dean Elias Compton, Dr. J. O. Notestein, Dr. J. M. Vance, representing the faculty, and Dr. Heron, Dr. Weir, and Dr. Wishard, representing the Board of Trustees, be

appointed to have charge of the selection of teachers, both of the Summer School and of the Normal Course, the giving of credits, the use of buildings, the apparatus, and any other questions of internal administration that may arise.

4. Be it *Resolved* that for the present the students of the Normal Course be assigned to college classes for such work as the normal courses may require.

After much open discussion in the Board concerning what these resolutions meant and the limitations of the same, it was the consensus of opinion in the Board that the whole conduct of the Summer School and the inauguration of the two-year Normal Course was entrusted by the Board of Trustees to this committee for the management of the same as the agents of the Board.

As Dean Elias Compton is the first named member of the committee, I suppose that it is his duty to call the committee together at the earliest possible moment for its organization and work.

Very truly yours,
[Signed] JESSE McCLELLAN,
Secretary.

Dean Compton was elected chairman, and Professor Notestein secretary of the committee.

Arrangements for the Summer School were discussed. Several matters were pointed out as among the reasons why the Summer School was in need of more careful supervision, especially in relation to work done for college credit. Attention was called to the fact that before the question of the Normal School was raised the faculty committee, to which the matter properly belonged, was taking steps toward defining the conditions under which college credit for work done in the Summer School could be given by the faculty. Among the matters needing remedy the following were pointed out: 1st, the admission of students of various grades of preparation to Summer School classes, instead of the application of eligibility rules such as the College enforced; 2nd, the granting of more credits in some courses than the time given and the amount of work covered warranted, including the allowance of too high a maximum of credits; 3rd, the granting of three credits in oratory for twelve private lessons, barely one fourth of the amount of work required; 4th, the encroachment of the chapel exercises upon the following recitation period, amounting to as much as one hour a week, with the result that the ground in certain courses given at this hour was only partially covered during the summer.

Attention was called to the fact that the Summer School instructor who gave the three credits for private lessons did so in violation of an explicit understanding with the College professor in charge of the department that credit should be given only for full class work; also that another instructor in the Summer School was reported as unfit because of his extreme eccentricities and his obnoxious talk in the presence of ladies. (This last matter may have been spoken of at the second meeting.)

In order that the summer work for college credit might be done in accordance with the standards of the College, the following plan of organization of the Summer School for the coming summer was adopted without a dissenting vote: That the Summer School be divided into two distinct sections, the College section and the Normal section; that the College department be conducted in connection with the College and that registration and payment of fees in this department be through the regular college channels, and that the College assume the financial responsibility for this department; that the Normal department include the normal courses, academy courses, and the miscellaneous courses. Prof. John B.

Kelso was chosen Dean of the College department and Professor Dickason as Principal of the Normal department. It was voted that Professor Dickason have charge of all matters for the coming summer as in former years, except in the College department; that he have charge of the lyceum course, the chapel exercises, the renting of the dormitories, etc.; and that all monies paid in, except in the College department be paid to him as in the past, he assuming the financial responsibility for the department.

It was voted that Principal Dickason be instructed to keep account of receipts and expenditures for his department and render an itemized financial report to the committee at the close of the summer.

It was voted that all teachers, courses to be offered, credits to be given, matter to be printed in the bulletin, or other advertising mediums, in both departments of the Summer School, and all lectures and other lyceum talent to be engaged for the normal department should be subject to the approval of the committee. And in order that the committee might have data on which to base judgment, it was ordered that Professor Kelso and Professor Dickason present, with the names of proposed teachers, a statement of the qualifications of each. Professors Notestein and Vance were appointed a sub-committee to read and pass upon all matter to be printed in advertising the Summer School and the Normal School.

A recommendation was made by Professor Dickason, through Professor Notestein of a man for dean of the elementary Normal School. The committee was not ready to act on this recommendation at this meeting.

The actions taken as above were constructive and fitted to meet the present needs of the situation.

On Monday, February 6, at 4:30 p. m., the committee held its second special meeting, Dr. Weir being absent. It appeared that, as Professor Kelso was out of town over Sunday, the secretary had not notified him of his appointment to be Dean of the College Department of the Summer School. But just before the meeting was called to order the secretary informed Dr. Kelso that he had other plans to propose than those which had been adopted at the previous meeting.

Professor Dickason had been notified and, being present, presented a list of twenty-four teachers with whom he had contracted for teaching college courses the coming summer, but presented no statement of their qualifications. Professor Notestein, in moving approval of these teachers, offered an interpretation of the action of the trustees in which the joint committee was created and its duties defined. (See above, p. 1.) Against the plain meaning of that action, which was accepted unchallenged at the first meeting of the committee, as conferring full responsibility and power for the control of the Summer School and for the inauguration and control of the elementary Normal School, he argued that the action could not have been intended to apply to the selection of teachers for next summer. The reason assigned for this surprising interpretation was that the trustees had not rescinded their action taken last October approving Professor Dickason's list of teachers for 1915, and that on the ground of this approval contracts were made and have not been cancelled. It was added that immediate action approving these teachers was urgently needed because that section of the Summer School bulletin in which the teaching staff appears was already in type and in part already printed at the Caslon Press,* and that the printing of this section must be completed immediately in order that the press may be moved by March 1.

*[Owned by Professors Notestein and Dickason.]

(The printing of the Summer School bulletin was under way in November. Early in December it was held up on account of a ruling by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction which overthrew the plan of giving the two-year normal work wholly in the Summer School. Immediately after the Board's action of February 2, the press work on the Bulletin was started again, before the committee had opportunity to meet, though it met on February 6.)

Professor Dickason supported the proposed interpretation of the Board's action by stating to this committee that he "dictated" the four items of the action to the Board's committee just before it was submitted to the Board for action, and that he had the assurance of the chairman of that committee that the committee would unanimously recommend action in accordance with the terms as he "dictated" them. Professor Dickason expressed surprise that in item 3 of the action, selection of teachers for the Summer School was included, as he had not put it there.

The chairman called attention to the fact that the trustees had in their communication (see p. 1) given the joint committee full responsibility and power and a *clean slate*, but that the new and surprising interpretation gave the committee a thoroughly *inscribed slate* and little, if anything, to do but to approve the recommendations of Professor Dickason. Nevertheless, in face of all that has occurred since October in rulings by the state authorities, and in faculty and Executive Committee and Board proceedings and in face of the plain meaning of the Board's minute, the novel interpretation carried and the list of twenty-four teachers of college courses for next summer was approved, Professor Vance not voting. No heed was given to the irregularities on the part of certain of the summer teachers to which attention had been called at this meeting or the meeting two days before. No heed was paid to the fact that nothing was presented concerning the qualifications of the teachers. No heed was given to the inconsistency of formally voting to approve these teachers after the claim had just been pressed and accepted by the majority that the selection of teachers for next summer by this committee was not intended by the Board as its own unrescinded approval of them in October must be assumed to stand.

Though the argument for the surprising construction put upon the trustees' action was that the *obvious* meaning of its terms was *not* its true meaning because its obvious meaning was alleged to be inconsistent with an action of the Board taken four months earlier and not formally reconsidered, yet, this joint committee, in its second meeting, had not reconsidered its action of only two days before. By parity of reasoning, then, its action at the second meeting would have to be interpreted to bring it into harmony with its action of the first meeting. Probably nobody's wits were nimble enough to interpret the two into harmony. At any rate, as soon as Professor Vance called attention to the inconsistency, it was at once voted to reconsider the action taken at the first meeting; that entire action was laid on the table; and it was ordered that the motion for reconsideration be recorded in its logical, not in its chronological order. The obvious fact is that the inconsistency of the second action with that of the first meeting was not noticed by those who voted it until the vote was taken. It is even more obvious that when the trustees took their action in February they did not think of their action in October. And if they had thought of it, it does not follow that they would have changed their February actions; they would have done either just what the joint committee did,—i. e. they would have reconsidered the October action,—or,

still more likely, they would have concluded that the new conditions which had arisen rendered reconsideration unnecessary.

These are not mere technicalities. The outstanding fact is that the ingenious construction of the Board's action pressed and accepted at the committee's second meeting, though it was an afterthought, resulted in the complete overthrow of all the constructive and supervisory measures adopted at the first meeting, which were excellently fitted to bring the Summer School into harmonious relations with the College. It resulted in the surrender of all control in the selection of teachers for the Summer School, including all those whose names are already printed who are to teach subjects in the two-year normal course. Not only so; it took from the committee any voice in or control over the plans and policies and courses of the Summer School and the published statements of the same so far as these appear in the part of the bulletin already on the press or off the press, and, by implication, what shall appear in the remainder of the bulletin, so far as this is determined by the portion already printed. It is true that a proposal was made to the effect that members of the committee should visit all summer classes in college subjects, with a view to enforcement of faculty regulations for credits in the College. But this would be of minor importance as related to the Summer School for 1915, the teachers for which and largely the plans for which are already, by the action at the second meeting, beyond the committee's control.

I held that the construction put upon the Board's action by the committee is unwarranted and impossible to square with the terms of the action. I feel that it places the committee in the untenable position of accountability for the Summer School, of having its unqualified responsibility published to the world, and yet of being reduced in reality to functionaries for approving what others have planned. My own position is made additionally difficult by reason not only of the facts set forth, but of my relation as chairman to the other function of the committee, the inauguration of the elementary Normal School and the calling of teachers to this school in which I do not believe and which, I am convinced, will have a precarious existence. For, as a committeeman to help inaugurate the school, I cannot express my conviction to a candidate for a position in the school, and yet I cannot in honor be party to calling a man from another institution in which he may have a comfortable position to this Normal School without acquainting him with my belief that the school will have a precarious existence. The reasons for this belief that the fortunes of the elementary Normal School will be uncertain, are stated in the faculty's reports on the matter in hand. The conviction is confirmed by recent rulings of the State Supervisor of Normal Schools, Dr. H. G. Williams. He has notified our Prof. A. J. Miller that, in a bulletin to be issued next week, he will announce certain regulations regarding summer schools so far as their work is to be accepted by the state in applications for certificates for teaching. He gives notice that among these new regulations will appear the following: (1) In order to prevent summer schools from employing superintendents and other teachers who have not had adequate professional training themselves to serve as professional trainers of teachers, only teachers with prescribed professional qualifications will have their work accepted by the state when their pupils offer it for certificates for teaching; (2) No summer teacher's work will be accepted who teaches more than twenty hours a week. The supervisor also pointed out to Professor Miller that all summer courses for training of teachers

should be so plainly published beforehand with credits to be given for them and the kind of teachers' certificates toward which they will apply that all pupils will know before they enter upon the courses just what credits they may expect and to what use the credit may be applied under the state provisions for certification of teachers. Of course these forthcoming administrative regulations will apply to the two-year normal work in the summer as well as to other summer normal work and to the teachers that will be permitted to teach the courses. These pre-announced regulations, together with the State Superintendent's letter in December that upset Professor Dickason's plan for administering the two-year normal course wholly in a series of summers, are some indications of one kind of reasons for the conviction that the Normal School to be established here will have to run the gauntlet of state regulations in competition with the state normals, and will have what I have called a precarious existence. This is why I say that to call a teacher from another position to this Normal School is to incur a responsibility to which there is attached a certain obligation of honor to be frank with the candidate,—a responsibility which would rest very directly on me as chairman of the committee that will issue the call.

Moreover, under all the circumstances which I have stated, I feel that in my position on the joint committee I am a mere piece of parliamentary mechanism presiding over deliberations which, so far as they relate to the next Summer School, are henceforth inconsequential, and, so far as they relate to the Normal School, directed to a procedure to which I do not have the consent of my judgment or conscience.

In view of the above facts, I herewith tender my resignation from the committee.

Yours respectfully,

[Signed] ELIAS COMPTON.

XIII.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE TRUSTEES AND PRESIDENT OF WOOSTER COLLEGE,
Wooster, Ohio.

Gentlemen:

We, the undersigned, Alumni and Alumnae of Wooster College, desirous that advancement be made to the highest college standards with reference to faculty, endowment, and courses of instruction, and that the College be held firmly to the college type as defining the sphere of its distinctive service, hereby respectfully recommend that your Honorable Body inaugurate and follow out a definite policy especially with respect to the following considerations, viz.:

First: The non-introduction into the College of normal courses for the training of elementary teachers, thus respecting the new policy of the state of Ohio which realizes and assumes its responsibility for the training of such teachers, and conforming to the practice of all high-grade colleges.

Second: The freedom of the administration from the undue influence of the Academy and Summer Normal School.

Third: Scrupulous care in the appointment of none but well trained teachers of graduate training to positions in the faculty with avoidance of promotion of academy teachers to the College faculty.

Fourth: Control of the administration of the Summer School by the trustees and faculty.

Fifth: The adoption of a plan similar to that in operation in other colleges by which the independence of the faculty will be guaranteed in matters purely educational and its majority ruling respected.

Sixth: The substitution for the present Executive Committee of an advisory committee which shall supervise the routine working of the College and from time to time report to the Board its recommendations in order to secure the best administration of the College; but said committee to have no power of dismissal or appointment of members of the faculty.

We regard it as significant that Phi Beta Kappa has refused to grant Wooster's application for a chapter in the college on grounds connected with academic standards. It is, therefore, our hope that the trustees and administration will hasten to take steps which will assure us of their determination to hold the College true to the standards of its type, and to keep it clear of all entangling Normal School alliances which, we believe, will lower our standards, obscure our ideals, and impair our reputation in the college world. Thus assured, our present state of apprehension will be allayed, and we can unite ourselves in loyal support of Wooster.

Presented to the Board, June 1, 1916.

**THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

**REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND
ACADEMIC TENURE**

1915-16

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

RECEIVED OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
AT THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
AT THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1913

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Address of President Dewey

General Report on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

Report on Conditions at the University of Utah

Report on Charges of Violation of Academic Freedom at the
University of Colorado and at Wesleyan University

Report on the Case of Professor Scott Nearing (Pennsylvania)

Report on Charges of Violation of Academic Freedom at the
University of Montana

Note.—All of these reports are also paged consecutively except that on Utah,
which was printed first.